

This file is a copy of my Ph.D. thesis (or dissertation in US terminology), submitted in 2002 (degree awarded in 2003). For reasons of copy-right, images are not included. I am currently working on a book project on the same topic (under contract with Alexandros Press), which will introduce some revisions on the basis of more recent scholarship and will have a more extensive discussion of the sources and use of the psalters. In most cases, the interpretation of individual miniatures will be along the same lines, but reinforced with new arguments. Please bear the above in mind if you use the following text in your research. Also note that Elina Dobrynina is preparing a publication on the Chludov Psalter that uses evidence from the restoration of the manuscript (some of her new findings are included in a relevant article available on Academia.edu).

**The Illustration of the Ninth-Century Byzantine
Marginal Psalters:
layers of meaning and their sources**

Maria Evangelatou

**Submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(History of Art)**

**Courtauld Institute of Art
University of London**

2002

To my father

Abstract

Three ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters (Moscow, State Historical Museum, cod. 129, Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery, cod. 61, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod. gr. 20), form a group of extensively illustrated and significant manuscripts of their period. This thesis engages with the many layers of meaning in their miniatures and identifies the nature and variety of their sources involved. The aim is to unravel the processes of their production and by this process to come to an understanding of their conceptual and visual functions in their original context.

A considerable part of this thesis is devoted to the analysis of their iconophile polemic. It will be seen that anti-iconoclastic allusions are far more extensive and embedded in these psalters than so far recognized. The methodology followed is to examine their subjects and iconographic details in the light of iconophile texts and other sources; this makes it possible to identify their common theological connotations and typological references and, at times, interpret iconographic novelties or rarities observed in the illustrations. Very often the miniatures express ideas which belong to the common currency of Byzantine theological and ecclesiastical writings and thought. In these cases the psalters can be seen as evidence of the norms of traditional Byzantine cultural and religious ideology. But in a number of cases the imagery is linked with specific eighth- and ninth-century texts of an individual character. Such correlations not only allow the recognition of topical and particular ideas as the source of the imagery, but also allow us to contextualize the manuscripts as belonging to the most highly educated and influential circles of Byzantine society in that period.

The approach adopted in this thesis gives a broader base for the understanding of these manuscripts, and particularly of the Chludov Psalter. It adds to our knowledge of the intellectual sophistication of these expressive miniatures, produced as a celebration of the triumph of the iconophiles over the iconoclasts, and the nature of the ways in which art was used as a polemical vehicle of justification, celebration and perpetuation of the victory of the iconophiles.

It is argued that the influence of the Byzantine liturgy on the illustration of these psalters has been underestimated, and that it is a regular and extensive component in the imagery of the miniatures, since liturgical interests can explain the choice and layout of a number of pages in the manuscripts. Another aspect of the illustration that is extensively analysed is the interrelation of miniatures on the same, facing or following pages, proven to be a characteristic element in the rhetoric and eloquence of the visual language of the psalters.

This examination of text and image in the psalters shows the stage theological exposition had reached in ninth-century Constantinople. It is accepted that the imagery and its construction represents the high point of Byzantine ecclesiastical thinking. The images are related to a long and rich literary tradition which intersected with the topical iconophile interests in their period of production.

Table of contents

List of illustrations.....	7
List of Tables.....	22
Acknowledgments.....	23
Introduction.....	25
I. Typology and tropology: the topical significance of biblical events.....	30
II. Old Testament scenes: a typological approach.....	47
1. David, biblical model of the iconophiles.....	48
Folios 23v-24r of the Chludov Psalter.....	49
Folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter.....	54
Folio 62v of the Chludov Psalter.....	67
Folio 148r of the Chludov Psalter.....	71
2. Scenes of Jewish history as typological allusions to the life of the New Israel...78	
Exodus from the land of heresy.....	79
Psalm 73: The drowned Pharaoh (Chludov Psalter, folio 72v, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 98v).....	83
The first Ode of Moses: the crossing of the Red Sea and the dance of Miriam (Chludov Psalter, folio 148v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 206r).....	89
Psalm 105: Iconophile virtue against iconoclast iniquity in biblical guise (Chludov Psalter, folios 109v-110r; Paris marginal Psalter, folios 17v-18r).....	97
Psalms 77-78: The suffering of the New Israel in the hands of the iconoclasts (Chludov Psalter, folios 78v-79r).....	105
III. New Testament scenes.....	120
1. Christ's miracles and teaching.....	121
Psalm 88: Christ calming the wind and sea (Chludov Psalter, folio 88r)...124	
Psalm 67: Christ exorcizing the demons (Chludov Psalter, folio 65r).....	134
Psalm 84: Christ the healer and redeemer (Chludov Psalter, folio 84v)....	146

III. 2. Christ's Resurrection.....	164
1. Christ rising from the Tomb (Chludov Psalter, folios 9v, 26v, 78v; Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r).....	169
Christ's Tomb as the Holy Sepulchre (type A – Chludov Psalter, folios 26v, 78v; Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r).....	174
The ciborium-like form of Christ's Tomb (type B – Chludov Psalter, folio 9v).....	181
The Temple veil.....	191
Christ the column.....	196
2. The Anastasis (Chludov Psalter, folios 63r, 63v, 82v 100v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 19v).....	209
Christ raising Holy Zion (Chludov Psalter, folio 100v).....	212
IV. Liturgy and the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters.....	226
Christ's Resurrection.....	231
Christ's Crucifixion.....	233
Christ's Baptism.....	234
Christ's Ascension.....	235
Conclusions.....	238
Appendix: The use of reference marks in the Chludov Psalter.....	246
Original reference marks.....	248
Original coloured initials (and reference marks).....	250
Bibliography.....	257
Abbreviations.....	257
Primary sources.....	258
Secondary literature.....	266
Photographic credits.....	285
Analysis of photographic-credit references.....	291
Illustrations.....	292
Key to the signs of the Tables.....	463
Tables.....	464

List of illustrations

- [Fig. 1. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 67r, Psalm 68:22. Crucifixion; iconoclasts whitewashing Christ's icon.](#)
- [Fig. 2. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 67v, Psalm 68:28-29. Jews bribing the guards at Christ's Tomb; iconoclast priest selling Church offices.](#)
- [Fig. 3. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 51v, Psalm 51:9. Peter trampling Simon Magus; Patriarch Nikephoros trampling the iconoclast John the Grammarian.](#)
- [Fig. 4. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 35v, Psalm 36:35. John the Grammarian inspired by a demon.](#)
- [Fig. 5. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 1v, facing the first Psalm. David the psalmist enthroned below a medallion of Christ.](#)
- [Fig. 6. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 2r, Psalm 1:1-4. Blessed man studying the scriptures; punishment of the ungodly and reward of the blessed.](#)
- [Fig. 7. Dura Europos, synagogue, west wall. Torah niche.](#)
- [Fig. 8. Jerusalem, Israel Museum. Mosaic floor from a synagogue at Beth Shean. Temple facade with tabernacle and implements.](#)
- [Fig. 9. St Petersburg, Hermitage Museum. Basilewsky Pyxis. Aaron in front of the tabernacle.](#)
- [Fig. 10. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 746, folio 342v \(detail\). Moses and Aaron before the tabernacle.](#)
- [Fig. 11. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 699, folio 89r. Christ's second coming – symbolic representation of the cosmos.](#)
- [Fig. 12. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 699, folio 108r \(detail\). Schematic representation of the cosmos.](#)
- [Fig. 13. Constantinople, Topkapi Sarayi Library. Cod. G.I.8, folio 333r \(detail\). Moses and Aaron before the tabernacle and the ark.](#)
- [Fig. 14. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 746, folio 231r \(detail\). The priests with the ark.](#)

[Fig. 15. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine. Cod. gr. 1186, folio 82r \(detail\). Zacharias and Abias with the ark.](#)

[Fig. 16. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine. Cod. gr. 1186, folio 69r \(detail\). The cosmos in the shape of the ark.](#)

[Fig. 17. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine. Icon with the Virgin Kykkotissa and prophets.](#)

[Fig. 18. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 16r \(detail\), Psalm 25:4-5. Patriarch Nikephoros refusing to participate at the iconoclast council of 815.](#)

[Fig. 19. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 165r, Psalm 13:12-16. David and the iconoclasts John the Grammarian argue the issue of idols in the presence of Beseleel, the Temple artist.](#)

[Fig. 20. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 23v, Psalm 25:5/9. Patriarch Nikephoros refusing to participate at the iconoclasts council of 815.](#)

[Fig. 21. Moscow, State Historical Musuem. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 24r, Psalm 26 \(title\). David and his flock.](#)

[Fig. 22. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 147v, Psalm 151:1-2. David sounding his psaltery; David killing the lion and the bear.](#)

[Fig. 23. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 148r, Psalm 151:7. David beheading Goliath.](#)

[Fig. 24. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 188v, Psalm 151:1-2. David sounding his psaltery; David killing the lion and the bear.](#)

[Fig. 25. St Petersburg, Public Library. Cod. 1252 F VI, Kiev Psalter, folio 205r \(detail\), Psalm 151:1-2. David sounding his psaltery; David killing the lion.](#)

[Fig. 26. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 2752, Tomič Psalter, folio 247v, Psalm 151:1-2. David sounding his psaltery; David killing the lion and the bear.](#)

[Fig. 27. Munich, Bayerisches Staatsbibliothek. Cod. slav. 4, Munich Psalter, folio 186r, Psalm 151:1-2/6-7. David sounding his psaltery; David confronting Goliath and killing the lion and the bear.](#)

[Fig. 28. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 752, folio 448r, Psalm 151:1-2. David and “Melodia”; David killing the lion.](#)

[Fig. 29. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine. Cod. gr. 61, folio 2v. David writing the psalms; David the shepherd playing his psaltery; and killing the bear \(facing Psalm 1\).](#)

[Fig. 30. Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery. Cod. 761, folio 11r. David and "Melodia" \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 31. Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery. Cod. 761, folio 11v. David killing the lion \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 32. Venice, Biblioteca Marciana. Cod. gr. Z 17, Psalter of Basil II, folio IVv. Six scenes from David's life \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 33. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 139, folio 2v. David killing the lion and the bear \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 34. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Silver plate \(17.190.394\) from the group of the nine "David plates" found in Cyprus. David killing the lion.](#)

[Fig. 35. Nicosia, Cyprus Museum. Silver plate \(J453\) from the group of the nine "David plates" found in Cyprus. David killing the bear.](#)

[Fig. 36. Rome, Catacomb of Praetextatus. Fresco. A shepherd defending his flock against a wild ass and a wild boar.](#)

[Fig. 37. Rome, Catacomb of Domitilla. Fresco. A shepherd and his flock approached by two wolves.](#)

[Fig. 38. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folios 27v-28r, Psalms 25:5/9 and 26 \(title\). Patriarch Nikephoros and Theodore the Studite holding an icon of Christ; in discussion with the iconoclast Emperor Leo V; iconoclasts whitewashing Christ's icon. A wolf stealing a sheep from David's flock.](#)

[Fig. 39. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 50v \(detail\), Psalm 50:13-14. David and the Holy Ghost.](#)

[Fig. 40. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 45r \(detail\), Psalm 44:11. Annunciation.](#)

[Fig. 41. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 139, folio 1v. David and Melodia.](#)

[Fig. 42. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 62v, Psalms 64:14 and 65:1. Deacons sounding *simandra*; Pentecost.](#)

[Fig. 43. Monastery of Osios Loukas, katholikon. Mosaic of the vault above the bema area. Pentecost.](#)

[Fig. 44. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 301r. Pentecost.](#)

[Fig. 45. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 355r. Second Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Fig. 46. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. suppl. gr. 1085, folio 107v \(detail\). Enthroned gospel surmounted by the Holy Ghost \(after the canons of the Seventh Ecumenical Council\).](#)

[Fig. 47. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Cod. Plut. VII, 32, folio 18v \(detail\). Pentecost.](#)

[Fig. 48. Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate. Cod. Taphou 14, folio 35r \(detail\). Pentecost.](#)

[Fig. 49. Oxford, Bodleian Library. Cod. Selden B. 54, folio 8v \(detail\). Pentecost.](#)

[Fig. 50. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Silver plate \(17.190.396\), the largest of the nine "David plates" found in Cyprus. David and Goliath.](#)

[Fig. 51. Rome, Palazzo Venezia. Ivory casket with scenes from David's life, rear side \(detail\). David beheading Goliath.](#)

[Fig. 52. Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 139, folio 4v. David and Goliath \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 53. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 333, folio 24r \(detail\). David beheading Goliath.](#)

[Fig. 54. Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery. Cod. 761, folio 13r. David beheading Goliath \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 55. Mount Athos, Dionysiou Monastery. Cod. 60, 210v. David and Goliath \(Psalm 151\).](#)

[Fig. 56. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 752, folio 2v \(detail\). David beheading Goliath \(before the psalms\).](#)

[Fig. 57. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 11836, folio 296r. David and Goliath after the beheading of the Philistine \(Psalm 151\).](#)

[Fig. 58. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 40753, folio 145v \(detail\). David beheading Goliath \(Psalm 151\).](#)

[Fig. 59. Athens, Benaki Museum. Cod. vitr. 34.3, folio 174r \(detail\). David beheading Goliath \(Psalm 151\).](#)

[Fig. 60. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 191r. David beheading Goliath; women sounding musical instruments \(after Psalm 151\).](#)

- [Fig. 61. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett. Cod. 78A 9, Hamilton Psalter, folio 43v \(detail\). David beheading Goliath \(before the psalms\).](#)
- [Fig. 62. St Petersburg, Public Library. Cod. 1252 F VI, Kiev Psalter, folio 205r \(detail\). David beheading Goliath \(Psalm 151\).](#)
- [Fig. 63. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 2752, Tomič Psalter, folio 248r. David and Goliath \(Psalm 151\).](#)
- [Fig. 64. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Cludov Psalter, folio 92r, Psalm 90:7. The massacre of the innocents \(detail\).](#)
- [Fig. 65. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 105v \(detail\), Psalm 104:9. The sacrifice of Isaac.](#)
- [Fig. 66. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 72v, Psalm 73:12-14. Crucifixion; birds pecking at the corpse of the drowned Pharaoh; Baptism.](#)
- [Fig. 67. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Triptych ivory panel \(17.190.44\). Crucifixion.](#)
- [Fig. 68. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 98r \(detail\), Psalm 73:12. Crucifixion.](#)
- [Fig. 69. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, folio 98v, Psalm 73:13-14. Baptism; birds pecking at the corpse of the drowned Pharaoh.](#)
- [Fig. 70. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 108r, Psalm 105:9-13. Crossing of the Red Sea.](#)
- [Fig. 71. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 103v \(detail\), Psalm 77:13. Crossing of the Red Sea.](#)
- [Fig. 72. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 20, Paris marginal Psalter, folio 16r \(detail\), Psalm 105:9-13. Crossing of the Red Sea.](#)
- [Fig. 73. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 148v, first Ode of Moses. Crossing of the Red Sea and dance of Miriam.](#)
- [Fig. 74. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 206r \(detail\), first Ode of Moses. Dance of Miriam after the crossing of the Red Sea.](#)
- [Fig. 75. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 264v. Upper register: Moses and the burning bush; conversion of Saul; ascension of Elijah. Lower register: crossing of the Red Sea and dance of Miriam.](#)

[Fig. 76. New York, Public Library. Spencer Collection, cod. gr. 1, folio 365v. Crossing of the Red Sea \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 77. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 192v. Crossing of the Red Sea and Miriam sounding her timbrel \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 78. Mount Athos, Monastery of the Great Lavra. Cod. B 26, folio 262r. Dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 79. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 752, folio 449v. Dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 80. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 746, folio 194v \(detail\). Dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women.](#)

[Fig. 81. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. Cod. slav. 4, Munich Psalter, folio 186v. Dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 82. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 2752, Tomič Psalter, folio 249v. Dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 83. Palermo, Biblioteca Nazionale. Cod. dep. Museo 4, folio 287v. Crossing of the Red Sea; dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 84. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett. Cod. 78A 9, Hamilton Psalter, folio 243v. Crossing of the Red Sea and dance of Miriam with the Hebrew women \(first Ode of Moses\).](#)

[Fig. 85. Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum. "The Monomachos crown" \(detail\). Two dancing women.](#)

[Fig. 86. Rome, Palazzo Venezia. Ivory casket with scenes from David's life, left narrow side \(detail\). Daughters of Israel dancing to celebrate David's victory over Goliath.](#)

[Fig. 87. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 333, folio 24r \(detail\). Daughters of Israel dancing to celebrate David's victory over Goliath.](#)

[Fig. 88. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 109v. Psalm 105:28-30/37. Jews adoring Beelphegor; Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi; Jews sacrificing their children.](#)

[Fig. 89. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 110r. Psalm 105:38/40-41. Jews sacrificing their children; Jews being taken captive.](#)

[Fig. 90. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 20, Paris marginal Psalter, folio 17v. Psalm 105:28-30. Jews adoring Beelphegor; Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi.](#)

- [Fig. 91. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 20, folio 18r, Psalm 105:37-38/40-41. Jews sacrificing their children; Jews being taken captive.](#)
- [Fig. 92. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 153v \(detail\), Psalm 105:30. Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi.](#)
- [Fig. 93. Venice, Biblioteca Marciana. Cod. gr. Z 17, Psalter of Basil II, folio 3r. Basil II receiving the imperial insignia from Christ and the archangels; his defeated foes prostrate at his feet.](#)
- [Fig. 94. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 747, folio 178v \(detail\). Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi.](#)
- [Fig. 95. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 923, folio 274v \(detail\). Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi.](#)
- [Fig. 96. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 144r, Psalm 105:28-30. Jews adoring Beelphegor; Phineas attacking a beast in a cave.](#)
- [Fig. 97. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 440r \(detail\). Constantine I killing Maxentius at the Milvian bridge.](#)
- [Fig. 98. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine. Side panels of a triptych icon. SS Theodore and George.](#)
- [Fig. 99. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 78v, Psalm 77:58/61-62/65. Jews adoring a demon; Jews defeated and taken captive; Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)
- [Fig. 100. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 79r, Psalms 78:68-70 and 79:1-2. Holy Zion; the anointing of David; martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees.](#)
- [Fig. 101. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 108v, Psalm 105:16-19. Punishment of Dathan and Abiron; Jews murmuring against Moses; Moses receiving the tablets of the Law and breaking them when he sees the Jews adoring the golden calf.](#)
- [Fig. 102. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 44r, Psalms 43:23/24/27 and 44:2. Martyrdom scene; the Myrophores at the Tomb; medallion of the Virgin and Child; martyrdom of St George.](#)
- [Fig. 103. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 110r, Psalm 78:1-3. Antiochos ordering the execution of the Seven Maccabees.](#)

- [Fig. 104. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 79r \(detail\), Psalm 78:1-2. Antiochos ordering the execution of the Seven Maccabees.](#)
- [Fig. 105. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 107r \(detail\), Psalm 104:40-41. Moses performing miracles for the Jews in the desert.](#)
- [Fig. 106. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 88r, Psalm 88:10. Christ calming the tempest on lake Tiberiad.](#)
- [Fig. 107. Venice, San Marco, north transept. Mosaic. Christ calming the tempest on lake Tiberiad](#)
- [Fig. 108. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 30r \(detail\), Psalm 33:14. Man refraining from speaking deceit.](#)
- [Fig. 109. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 70v, Psalm 72:4/9. Death of sinners; heretics speaking against the Church of God.](#)
- [Fig. 110. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 10v, Psalms 10:6 and 11:4-5. Punishment of sinners; punishment of a blasphemer.](#)
- [Fig. 111. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 65r, Psalm 67:28/31/32. Icon of St Paul; Christ expelling the legion of demons from the Gerasene; Philip meeting the Ethiopian eunuch and baptizing him.](#)
- [Fig. 112. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 85v \(detail\), Psalm 67:32. Philip meeting the Ethiopian eunuch and baptizing him.](#)
- [Fig. 113. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 85r, Psalm 67:31/32. Christ expelling the legion of demons from the Gerasene; Philip meeting the Ethiopian eunuch and baptizing him.](#)
- [Fig. 114. Paris, Musée du Louvre. Ivory plaque \(OA.7876-7878\) with Christ's miracles. Christ and the woman in haemorrhage; Christ and the paralytic; Christ and the Gerasene.](#)
- [Fig. 115. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 923, folio 212v \(detail\). Christ expelling the legion of demons from the Gerasene.](#)
- [Fig. 116. Mount Athos, Iviron Monastery. Cod. 5, folio 156r \(detail\). Christ expelling the legion of demons from the Gerasene.](#)
- [Fig. 117. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 84v, Psalm 84:3. Christ with Zacchaeus, the woman in haemorrhage and the prostitute.](#)

- [Fig. 118. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 118r \(detail\), Psalm 84:3. Christ with Zacchaeus and the prostitute.](#)
- [Fig. 119. Rome, Catacomb of SS Marcellinus and Petrus. Fresco. Christ and the woman in haemorrhage.](#)
- [Fig. 120. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Hematite amulet \(17.190.491\). Christ and the woman in haemorrhage.](#)
- [Fig. 121. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 923, folio 212r \(detail\). Christ with Jairus and the woman in haemorrhage.](#)
- [Fig. 122. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 101v \(detail\), Psalm 102:3. Christ healing the infirm.](#)
- [Fig. 123. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 52r \(detail\), Psalm 52:3-4. Christ and the rich man.](#)
- [Fig. 124. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 66r, Psalm 68:10. Christ expelling the merchants and money-changers from the Temple.](#)
- [Fig. 125. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 26v, Psalm 30:5/7. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)
- [Fig. 126. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 109r \(detail\), Psalm 77:65. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)
- [Fig. 127. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 26v \(detail\), Psalm 11:6. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)
- [Fig. 128. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 30v, Psalm 30:5/7. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)
- [Fig. 129. Munich, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum. Ivory plaque \(MA 157\). The Myrophores at the Tomb; Christ ascending to heaven.](#)
- [Fig. 130. Milan, Castello Sforzesco, Civiche Raccolte d'Arte et Incisioni. Ivory plaque from a diptych \(Avori 9\). The Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)
- [Fig. 131. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Cod. Plut. I, 56, Rabbula Gospels, folio 13r \(detail\). The Myrophores at the Tomb; Chairete.](#)
- [Fig. 132. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 30v. Crucifixion; Deposition and Entombment; Chairete.](#)
- [Fig. 133. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 87r \(detail\), Psalm 87:7. Entombment.](#)

[Fig. 134. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 122r \(detail\), Psalm 87:7. Entombment.](#)

[Fig. 135. Bobbio, Cathedral Treasury. Ampulla no. 18 \(detail\). The Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 136. Monza, Cathedral Treasury. Ampulla no. 11 \(detail\). The Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 137. Representations of the Holy Sepulchre on ampullae from Monza and Bobbio. "Type A" according to Barag – Wilkinson \(1974\), fig. 2.](#)

[Fig. 138. Reconstruction of the Constantinian Sepulchre according to Wilkinson \(1972\), pl. X. A.](#)

[Fig. 139. Narbonne, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire. "The Narbonne model" of the Holy Sepulchre.](#)

[Fig. 140. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 78v \(detail\), Psalm 77:65. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 141. Copenhagen, National Museum, Antiksamling. Floor mosaic \(15.137\), possibly from Syria. Holy Sepulchre.](#)

[Fig. 142. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 6r \(detail\), Psalm 7:7. David awaiting Christ to rise from the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 143. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks, Byzantine Collection. Marble plaque \(38.56\). Holy Sepulchre.](#)

[Fig. 144. Monza, Cathedral Treasury. Ampulla no. 13 \(detail\). The Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 145. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 4r \(detail\), Psalm 4:7. David prophesying concerning the Cross.](#)

[Fig. 146. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 98v \(detail\), Psalm 98:5-6. The Cross; Moses, Aaron and Samuel.](#)

[Fig. 147. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 131v \(detail\), Psalm 131:6. David prophesying concerning Christ's birth at Bethlehem; the Church of the Nativity and the Holy Manger at Bethlehem.](#)

[Fig. 148. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 184v \(detail\), Psalm 131:6. The Church of the Nativity and the Holy Manger at Bethlehem.](#)

[Fig. 149. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 9v, Psalm 9:33. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 150. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 10r \(detail\), Psalm 9:33. Christ rising from the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 151. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 11v \(detail\), Psalm 11:6. Christ teaching about his Resurrection.](#)

[Fig. 152. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 163v \(detail\), Symeon's Prayer. Christ's Presentation to the Temple.](#)

[Fig. 153. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 115r \(detail\), Psalm 109:4. Communion of the apostles, flanked by David and Melchisedek.](#)

[Fig. 154. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 543, folio 260v \(detail\). Koimesis of St Athanasios.](#)

[Fig. 155. Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate. Cod. Taphou 14, folio 311v \(detail\). Mausoleum of Halikarnassos.](#)

[Fig. 156. Dečani, narthex. Wall-painting. *Melismos*.](#)

[Fig. 157. St Petersburg, Hermitage Museum. Ivory plaque \(ω 26\). Crucifixion; rising of the dead.](#)

[Fig. 158. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Ivory pyxis \(17.190.57\). The Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 159. Cleveland, The Cleveland Museum of Art. Ivory pyxis \(51.114a,b\). The Jewish Temple in the scene of Christ's Entry into Jerusalem.](#)

[Fig. 160. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 7169, folio 12v \(detail\). The Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 161. Vienna, Mekhitharist Library. Cod. 697, folio 6r. Holy Sepulchre.](#)

[Fig. 162. Etchmiazin, Treasury. Cod. 229, folio 5v. Holy Sepulchre.](#)

[Fig. 163. Adysh, Treasury. Loose folio from a gospel. Holy Sepulchre.](#)

[Fig. 164. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 1162, folio 127v \(detail\). Annunciation: the Virgin accepting her mission.](#)

[Fig. 165. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 1162, folio 122r \(detail\). Annunciation: Gabriel revealing to the Virgin the mystery of the Incarnation.](#)

[Fig. 166. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 1162, folio 29r \(detail\). Nativity of the Virgin.](#)

[Fig. 167. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. gr. 1162, folio 46v \(detail\). Anna placing the Virgin in her own room.](#)

[Fig. 168. Tokali Kilise, New Church, central apse. Upper register: Crucifixion. Lower register: Deposition and Entombment; Anastasis and the Myrophores at the Tomb.](#)

[Fig. 169. Erevan, Matenadaran. Cod. 7651, folios 79v-80r. Crucifixion.](#)

[Fig. 170. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Museo Sacro. Glass cup \(176\). Two apostles flanking a column surmounted by the Christogram.](#)

[Fig. 171. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Glass bowl \(16.174.3\). The apostles Peter and Paul flanking a column surmounted by the Christogram.](#)

[Fig. 172. Oxford, Christ Church College. Cod. gr. 12, folio 28v. Matthew and Christ Emmanuel.](#)

[Fig. 173. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine, katholikon. Mosaic decoration of the apse \(Transfiguration\), and the triumphal arch \(see fig. 174\).](#)

[Fig. 174. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine, katholikon. Triumphal arch mosaic. Upper register: Moses and the burning bush; column between two windows; Moses receiving the tablets of the Law. Lower register: medallions with John the Baptism and the Virgin; two flying angels flanking a central medallion of the Lamb of God.](#)

[Fig. 175. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine, katholikon. Mosaic decoration of the apse and the triumphal arch.](#)

[Fig. 176. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine, katholikon. Triumphal arch mosaic, upper register \(detail\). Column between two windows.](#)

[Fig. 177. Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine, catholicon. Triumphal arch mosaic, lower register \(detail\). Central medallion of the Lamb of God.](#)

[Fig. 178. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 174v. Sacrifice of Isaac; Jacob struggling with the angel and Jacob's dream; the anointing of David.](#)

[Fig. 179. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. gr. 510, folio 452r. Scenes from the life of St Gregory Nazianzenus.](#)

[Fig. 180. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale. Cod. Paris. gr. 139, folio 3v. The anointing of David.](#)

[Fig. 181. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cod. Reg. gr. 1, folio 263r. The anointing of David.](#)

[Fig. 182. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 82r \(detail\), Psalm 80:17. Moses extracting water from the rock.](#)

- [Fig. 183. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 114r \(detail\), Psalm 80:17. Moses extracting water from the rock.](#)
- [Fig. 184. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 64r, Psalm 67:16. Daniel's vision of the rock uncut by human hands.](#)
- [Fig. 185. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 63v, Psalm 67:7. Anastasis.](#)
- [Fig. 186. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 82v, Psalm 81:8. Anastasis.](#)
- [Fig. 187. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 100v, Psalm 101:7/14. Night-crows; Anastasis of Holy Zion.](#)
- [Fig. 188. London, British Library. Cod. Add. 19352, Theodore Psalter, folio 134v, Psalm 101:14. Anastasis of Holy Zion.](#)
- [Fig. 189. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 86v, Psalm 86:5. David before an icon of the Virgin and Child hanging on the walls of Holy Zion.](#)
- [Fig. 190. Mount Athos, Pantokrator Monastery. Cod. 61, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 121r \(detail\), Psalm 86:5. David before an icon of the Virgin and Child hanging on the walls of Holy Zion.](#)
- [Fig. 191. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 63r, Psalm 67:2. Anastasis.](#)
- [Fig. 192. Venice, San Marco, west arch of the central dome. Mosaic of the Anastasis.](#)
- [Fig. 193. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 14r, Psalm 17:11. Ascension.](#)
- [Fig. 194. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 22r, Psalm 23:7/9. Ascension.](#)
- [Fig. 195. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 46v, Psalm 46:6. Ascension.](#)
- [Fig. 196. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 55v, Psalm 56:6. Ascension.](#)
- [Fig. 197. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 75v, Psalm 76:17/19. Baptism; the apostles John and Jacob.](#)
- [Fig. 198. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 113:5/14-15. Baptism; idols of the nations.](#)

[Fig. 199. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 22v \(detail\), Psalm 24:10. Martyr. \(Appendix no. 1\).](#)

[Fig. 200. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 30r \(detail\), Psalm 33:9/14. Multiplication of the loaves and fishes; man refraining from speaking deceit. \(Appendix no. 3\).](#)

[Fig. 201. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 30v \(detail\), Psalm 33:18/21. The Just; reliquary. \(Appendix no.4\).](#)

[Fig. 202. Detail of Fig. 201 \(Appendix no. 12\).](#)

[Fig. 203. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 65v \(detail\), Psalm 67:36. Holy martyrs. \(Appendix no. 6\).](#)

[Fig. 204. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 10r \(detail\), Psalm 10:1-2. A sparrow; sinners bending their bows against the righteous. \(Appendix no. 7\).](#)

[Fig. 205. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 31v \(detail\), Psalm 34:11. False witnesses testifying to the high priest against Christ. \(Appendix no. 8\).](#)

[Fig. 206. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 32v \(detail\), Psalm 35:1. Judas. \(Appendix no. 9\).](#)

[Fig. 207. Detail of fig. 197 \(Appendix no. 10\).](#)

[Fig. 208. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 13v \(detail\), Psalm 17:1. David prays. \(Appendix no. 11\).](#)

[Fig. 209. Detail of fig. 208 \(Appendix no. 11\).](#)

[Fig. 210. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 45v \(detail\), Psalm 45:7. Crucifixion. \(Appendix no. 13\).](#)

[Fig. 211. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 46r \(detail\), Psalm 46:2. The nations rejoicing for Christ's coming. \(Appendix no. 13\).](#)

[Fig. 212. Detail of fig. 210 \(Appendix no. 13\)](#)

[Fig. 213. Detail of fig. 211 \(Appendix no. 13\).](#)

[Fig. 214. Detail of fig. 117 \(Appendix no. 15\).](#)

[Fig. 215. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 90v \(detail\), Psalm 89:1. Moses prostrate before Christ's medallion. \(Appendix no. 16\).](#)

[Fig. 216. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 54v, Psalm 55:1/6. David's arrest juxtaposed to Christ's arrest; Jews rejecting Christ's words. \(Appendix no. 17\).](#)

[Fig. 217. Detail of fig. 216 \(Appendix no. 17\).](#)

[Fig. 218. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 33v \(detail\), Psalm 35:13. Jews attempting to arrest Christ. \(Appendix no. 18\).](#)

[Fig. 219. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 35r \(detail\), Psalm 36:26. Charity giving alms to the poor. \(Appendix no. 19\).](#)

[Fig. 220. Detail of fig. 219 \(Appendix no. 19\).](#)

[Fig. 221. Detail of fig. 195 \(Appendix no. 21\).](#)

[Fig. 222. Detail of fig. 196 \(Appendix no. 22\).](#)

[Fig. 223. Detail of fig. 186 \(Appendix no. 23\).](#)

[Fig. 224. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 92v, Psalm 90:11. The temptation of Christ. \(Appendix no. 24\).](#)

[Fig. 225. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 96v \(detail\), Psalm 95:10. Christ sending the apostles to teach the nations. \(Appendix no. 25\).](#)

[Fig. 226. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 116r \(detail\), Psalm 111:9. Charitable man giving alms to the poor. \(Appendix no. 26\).](#)

[Fig. 227. Detail of fig. 3 \(Appendix no. 27\).](#)

[Fig. 228. Details of fig. 88 \(Appendix no. 28\).](#)

[Fig. 229. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 47v \(detail\), Psalm 48:4. St John Chrysostom. \(Appendix no. 30\).](#)

[Fig. 230. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 88v, Psalm 88:13. Transfiguration. \(Appendix no. 32\).](#)

[Fig. 231. Moscow, State Historical Museum. Cod. 129, Chludov Psalter, folio 89r, Psalm 88:21. The anointing of David.](#)

List of tables

Table 1. David as a shepherd in Byzantine psalters (except the marginal ones).....	468
Table 2. David beheading Goliath in Byzantine psalters (except the marginal ones).....	469
Table 3. Byzantine psalters illustrating the first Ode of Moses with only the crossing of the Red Sea (or related episodes) but not the dance of Miriam.....	470
Table 4. The dance of Miriam and the Hebrew women in Byzantine and related Slavonic psalters, and Byzantine octateuchs.....	471
Table 5. Psalms illustrated with the Resurrection in the ninth- and eleventh-century Byzantine marginal psalters.....	472
Table 6. Psalms that were interpreted as prophetic of Christ's Resurrection in Byzantine psalm commentaries, but were not illustrated accordingly in the ninth- and eleventh-century marginal psalters.....	473
Table 7. Psalms illustrated with Christ's Crucifixion, the Cross, or other related scenes in the ninth- and eleventh-century Byzantine marginal psalters.....	476
Table 8. Psalms that were interpreted as prophetic of Christ's Passion on the Cross in Byzantine psalm commentaries, but were not illustrated accordingly in the ninth- and eleventh-century marginal psalters.....	477
Table 9. Psalms illustrated with Christ's Baptism in the ninth- and eleventh-century Byzantine marginal psalters.....	478
Table 10. Psalms that were interpreted as prophetic of Christ's Baptism in Byzantine psalm commentaries, but were not illustrated accordingly in the ninth- and eleventh-century marginal psalters.....	478
Table 11. Psalms illustrated with Christ's Ascension in the ninth- and eleventh-century Byzantine marginal psalters.....	479
Table 12. Psalms that were interpreted as prophetic of Christ's Ascension in Byzantine psalm commentaries, but were not illustrated accordingly in the ninth- and eleventh-century marginal psalters.....	479

Acknowledgments

Many people have contributed in one way or another to the making of this thesis, and I am happy to acknowledge my gratitude to them here.

First and foremost I thank my father for his generous economic and emotional support in all the years of my studies. Without him I would never have arrived at where I am now.

I am most grateful to my supervisor, Professor Robin Cormack, not only for guiding me in my research and editing the thesis, but also for believing that I had something new to say on a subject that already has a long bibliography. Actually, the idea to study the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters originates from a weekly essay he assigned to his MA students in the Courtauld Institute of Art when I was attending the course back in 1998.

I am much obliged to Ellen Sutton for language-editing the larger part of the text. It goes without saying that responsibility for the final version of this thesis lies entirely with me.

A number of institutions have funded my research. The Arts and Humanities Research Board of the British Academy have supported me most decisively by covering my tuition fees in the Courtauld Institute of Art. The Antonis Levendis Institute and the British Federation of Women Graduates have contributed generous grants. The Central Research Fund of the University of London, the Courtauld Institute of Art, and the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies have covered part of my travel expenses for field research. I feel that on this occasion I should also thank the Lilian Voudouris Institute and the Italian government for funding the studies I made before embarking on my Ph.D. research.

My warmest thanks to the authorities and staffs of many libraries that have allowed me to study a number of manuscripts, even some that are usually inaccessible: the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, the Biblioteca Ambrosiana and the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Italy; the British Library in London, and especially Dr. Scot McKendrick; the Kupferstichkabinett-Sammlung der Zeichnungen und Druckgraphik of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin-

Preussischem Kulturbesitz, and especially Dr Heinz-Th. Schulze Altcapenberg; the Library of the Benaki Museum and the National Library of Greece in Athens. I thank Dr Christian Förstel for allowing me to study in repeated visits to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris cod. Paris. gr. 20 and cod. Paris. gr. 923; Dr Elena Serebriakova, Head of the Manuscripts Department, and Tamara Igoumnova, Deputy Director, the State Historical Museum, Moscow, for allowing me to see the Chludov Psalter, and Alexei Lidov for his help and organisation during my visit in Moscow; Dr Giannis Tavlakis, Director of the Thirteenth Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, and the Hegoumenos of the Pantokrator Monastery on Mount Athos for allowing me to see the Pantokrator Psalter after the closure of the exhibition “Treasures of Mount Athos” in Thessaloniki. I am most grateful to the Director of the Byzantine and Christian Museum in Athens, Dr. Dimitrios Konstantios, and to the Deputy Director, Dr. Eugenia Chalkia, for allowing me to use and borrow books from the museum library, and for offering me their support and understanding in many other ways. My thanks also to the staff of the museum library, as well as to the staff of the library of the Warburg Institute in London.

I am most grateful to a number of scholars that have offered me valuable advice, constructive comments, or offprints of their publications: Dmitry Afinogenov, Elias Antonopoulos, Marie-France Auzépy, Leslie Brubaker, Boris Fonkič, Anna Kartsonis, Alexei Lidov, John Lowden, Paul Magdalino, Nancy Paterson-Ševčenko, Glenn Peers, and Panteleimon Tsorbatzoglou.

Special thanks to Euphrosini Doxiadi, Cecily Hennessy, Eirene Leondakianakou, Ioanna Rapti, Patricia Skotti, Giannis Vitaliotis, for helping me in the most various and valuable ways; also to Nadin Athanasiadou, Nikos Garilides, and their son Christopher, Eirene Grammatopoulou, and Evangelia Roussou for their generous hospitality and friendship in London.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their continuing support; my mother for being my doctor and dealing with my stress; my grandmother, grandfather, and godmother for their love; my friends Litsa and Basilis, Melina, and Giorgos for being there for me; and Thanasis, who kept me going the last two years.

Introduction

The three surviving Byzantine marginal psalters of the ninth century that are the subject of this thesis were produced at a critical period in the history of Byzantine culture and art in particular. This was the aftermath of the iconoclast controversy, the intense confrontation on the legitimacy of religious art that began around 730 and officially ended with the triumph of Orthodoxy in 843. Although scholars are not yet unanimous regarding the causes, aims, and consequences of the iconoclast crisis,¹ one thing is certain: the controversy proves most eloquently the great power of images in Byzantine civilization as a means of expression and communication of all levels of society with each other and with God. The aim of this thesis will be to show that the visual language used in the miniatures of the ninth-century marginal psalters, and especially in the best-preserved codex of the group, is one of the most impressive artistic and intellectual products of iconophile thinking, and a high achievement of Byzantine visual culture.

The manuscripts in question are the so-called Chludov Psalter (cod.129 of the State Historical Museum in Moscow),² the Pantokrator Psalter (cod. 61 of the Pantokrator Monastery on Mount Athos),³ and the Paris marginal Psalter (Bibliothèque Nationale, cod. gr. 20).⁴ They were probably executed in Constantinople shortly after the final triumph of Orthodoxy in 843, in the circle of the Patriarch Methodios (843-47) or, less likely, Patriarch Photios (858-67, 877-86),⁵ and they contain the psalms and biblical odes illustrated with an extensive corpus of

¹ A sample of various, and often incompatible views can be found in: Brown (1973); Cameron (1992); Tsorbatzoglou (1995); Whittow (1996), 139-164; Tsorbatzoglou (2002). See also Martin (1978) for a historical account. For historical and art-historical studies see *Iconoclasm* (1977); Cormack (1985), 98-178. On the sources and the material culture of the period Brubaker – Haldon (2001).

² Published in facsimile edition by Ščepkina (1977).

³ Published by Dufrenne (1966), 7-37, pls. 1-33; coloured photographs of some miniatures by Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), 265-280, pls. 180-237; see also Anderson (1994); Anderson (1998).

⁴ Published by Dufrenne (1966), 40-46, pls. 34-46. The most extensive study up to now for all three psalters is by Corrigan (1992).

⁵ See Corrigan (1992), 124-134; in pp. 131-34 she seems to favour the attribution of the psalters to the circle of Patriarch Methodios; cf. Ševčenko (1965); Walter (1987), 220; also mentioned by Brubaker (1999), 25; Brubaker – Haldon (2001), 44.

marginal miniatures (scenes from the Old and New Testament, literal illustrations of psalm verses and others related to the iconoclast controversy).⁶ These manuscripts have attracted the interest of many scholars, not only because they are the earliest survivors of a long tradition of marginal-psalter illustration in Byzantium and its periphery,⁷ but also due to their early post-iconoclast dating. This renders them a valuable source on the art of the period, especially since other surviving material evidence is scarce.⁸

The most important information provided to us by these psalters is not on the development of style and iconography in the Byzantine art of the ninth century, but on the sophisticated and multi-layered relationship between text and image. This denotes a highly elaborate system of artistic conception and perception in Byzantium,⁹ in this case employed in reference to religious and political issues of major concern to the creators and users of the codices in question. Grabar has laid the foundation for this kind of interpretative approach,¹⁰ and Corrigan has carried the investigation much further, relating a number of miniatures in the ninth-century psalters to what she calls “the defence of Orthodoxy”.¹¹ Although she focuses her research on the iconophile connotations of the illustration, she also proposes a reading in the light of anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim polemics.¹²

The purpose of the present study is to demonstrate that pro-Orthodox and specifically anti-iconoclast allusions are far more extensive in these psalters than has so far been recognized. It is proposed that the greater part of the illustrations can be

⁶ For a description of the manuscripts see Corrigan (1992), 140-147, and the publications cited in notes 3-5 above.

⁷ The eleventh-century Theodore and Barberini Psalters (British Library, cod. Add. 19352, published by Der Nersessian [1970]; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, cod. Barb.gr. 372, published by Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989]) are considered indirect copies of the Chludov Psalter (Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989], 40-52. The early eleventh-century Bristol Psalter (British Library, cod. Add. 40731) is related to the Pantokrator Psalter and to the tradition of Psalter illustration before the ninth century (published by Dufrenne [1966], 48-66, pls. 47-60; see also Dufrenne [1964]; Anderson [1994]). Other four marginal psalters survive that can be affiliated to this tradition. Two Greek psalters of the eleventh-century: Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, W 733 (Miner [1955]; Cutler [1977]); Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine, cod. 48 (Weitzmann [1980]). The early fourteenth-century Greek and Latin Hamilton Psalter, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, 78A 9 (Havice [1978]; Havice [1984]). The fourteenth-century Slavonic Kiev Psalter, St Petersburg, Public Library, 1252 F VI (Vzdornov [1978]). For comparative records on the illustration of these and some other psalters see Dufrenne (1978).

⁸ On the material culture of the period around 680-850 see Brubaker – Haldon (2001), 3-158; 43-47 with reference to the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters.

⁹ See also Brubaker (1989); Brubaker (1989a); Brubaker (1999), 19-23.

¹⁰ Grabar (1984), 225-44; Grabar (1965), esp. 74.

¹¹ Corrigan (1992).

¹² Corrigan (1992), 43-61, 78-103.

related to theological arguments and/or rhetorical expressions of eight- and ninth-century iconophile polemics, and that this can frequently explain the choice of subject matter and iconography. It is hoped that by shedding more light on why and how these manuscripts were produced, and how they were read shortly after 843, will enhance the understanding and appreciation of the sophisticated visual language employed in the high circles of Constantinopolitan post-iconoclast society.

The limits of a Ph.D. thesis have obliged me to present only a small number of the many miniatures illustrating the ninth-century psalters. I have focused on a few rather than make brief reference to many, and this allows me to set out my interpretative approach with solid paradigms that exemplify how the rest of the miniatures may be read. In order to unlock the iconophile allusions of the illustration I have used the key of eighth- and ninth-century iconophile literature: basically the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council that in 787 reinstated icon veneration after the first period of iconoclasm; the writings of major iconophile personalities, like John of Damascus, Theodore the Studite, and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Germanos, Nikephoros, Methodios and Photios; finally, a number of other relevant texts such as the eighth-century iconophile treatise known as *Nouthesia*, the ninth-century *Chronikon* of George the monk, and various saints' lives.¹³ In these texts I have tried to identify both theological arguments and rhetoric expressions that can shed light on the iconophile implications of ninth-century marginal psalter illustration, since both texts and images are products of the same period and most probably also of the same environment of highly educated iconophile clergy. I have further attempted to demonstrate that many of these theological arguments and rhetorical expressions belong to the rich and long-lived tradition of Early Christian and Byzantine religious literature (as attested in Church councils, dogmatic treatises, homilies, hymns, etc.) – that, in other words, they present ideas that were commonplace and therefore easily recognizable in the cultural milieu in which the psalters were produced. (At times I even quote texts of a later period in order to demonstrate the persistence of such ideas

¹³ For a list of most of the texts I have employed – obviously not exhaustive of the relevant material – see the Bibliography, Primary Sources. (On a complete list of the written sources for the period 680-850 see Brubaker – Haldon [2001], 165-307). The order of reference to these sources in the footnotes is usually according to chronological sequence, type of text and importance. E.g., first are mentioned chronologically the major sources, John of Damascus, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, Patriarch Nikephoros, Theodore the Studite; then come in chronological order other texts, such as the *Nouthesia* and the *Chronikon*; finally are mentioned saints' lives, following the chronology of their heroes, e.g. *Life of Stephen the Younger*, *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, *Vita Nicephori*, etc. For the circulation of John of Damascus' works in Constantinople see Brubaker (1999), 31.

in the Byzantine culture).¹⁴ With regard to issues already extensively discussed by scholars, especially where iconophile literature is concerned, I usually refer directly to the bibliography. When a subject is less well known I prefer to make a substantial number of references to the primary sources.

The images selected for presentation are examined in relation to others in the manuscripts so as to pinpoint their underlying mentality and corroborate their interpretation. Their compositional structure, iconographic details, and correlation with other miniatures of the same or facing folios are all used in the exploration of their message. As in previous studies, the eleventh-century Theodore and Barberini Psalters, considered indirect copies of the Chludov Psalter – their model though to be a now lost copy of the same manuscript –, are used as evidence for the illustrated folios that are today missing from the ninth-century codices.¹⁵ Since the Chludov Psalter preserves the most numerous and most complex miniatures, it is more extensively discussed than the other two contemporary codices;¹⁶ however, the conclusions of the research illuminate a method of visual exegesis that to a large extent is present in the illustration of all three ninth-century marginal psalters.

Compared to previous studies, this thesis gives much greater importance to the metaphorical function of the biblical psalter miniatures – in other words, to their typological allusions to contemporary Church history. For this reason, the first chapter is dedicated to a general investigation of the typological pattern in Byzantine thinking, and particularly in psalm exegesis, in order to emphasize how commonplace it was for the Byzantines to see the history of their empire and their Church as parallel to the biblical story, and especially to the confrontation of good and evil as narrated in the psalms. In the second chapter this mentality is applied to the interpretation of certain Old Testament miniatures in the ninth-century marginal psalters, read as allusions to the confrontation of iconoclasts and iconophiles. The same typological approach, in addition to an analysis of theological allusions, is employed also in the third chapter

¹⁴ In the footnotes reference is made first to the Acts of the ecumenical councils (in chronological order) and then to all the other texts (in chronological order, or according to the sequence of publication in *PG*). Even if the ninth-century marginal psalters were made before the patriarchate of Photios, his texts are relevant to the following analysis, since Photios gives us an idea of how at least part of the higher clergy of his time would have perceived iconoclasm and the textual or visual polemics against it.

¹⁵ See note 7 above.

¹⁶ Much more psalms are missing today from the Pantokrator Psalter than the Chludov Psalter (Corrigan [1992], 143, 145, and Dufrenne [1966], 15-16). The Paris marginal Psalter is in a very fragmentary state, preserving only Psalms 92-136 with various lacunae in between (Dufrenne [1966], 41).

in order to disclose the iconophile connotations of certain New Testament miniatures. The fourth chapter briefly presents evidence on the extensive and systematic influence of the Byzantine liturgy on the illustration of these psalters, a factor interpreted as working not only independently but also in support of the iconophile character of the codices. Finally, in the Appendix I present evidence attesting to the ninth-century origin of many reference marks that in the Chludov Psalter relate miniatures with specific psalm. This sheds more light on the exegetical nature of the manuscript's illustration and reinforces the impression that the codex was produced for meditation on not only the psalm text but the accompanying imagery as well.

The many layers of meaning, the complexity of references, and the sophisticated manipulation of the visual language in ninth-century marginal-psalter illustration allow us to relate the production of these manuscripts with the most highly educated and influential circles of post-iconoclast Byzantine society.¹⁷ For this reason I usually refer to the planners of the codices and not just to the painters when dealing with the choice of subject matter and the iconographic and compositional details that give the miniatures their pronounced multi-faceted and specifically iconophile character. Following Corrigan, I assume that these planners were highly educated churchmen who may either themselves have been the painters of the miniatures (as evidence on the artistic activity of ninth-century religious leaders suggests), or they collaborated closely with the miniaturists who must themselves have been familiar with the complex religious ideas communicated through the eloquent and subtle visual language of the manuscripts.¹⁸ In any case, it seems that planners, painters, and users of the ninth-century marginal psalters came from the highest levels of Byzantine intellectual society.¹⁹ This fact makes an analysis of the manuscripts' illustration exceptionally important for our understanding of the artistic production of this society at the aftermath of a fierce confrontation concerning exactly the use of religious art as vehicle of cultural, social, and eventually political expression.

¹⁷ Corrigan (1992), for example, 6-7, 123, 129-134, 137.

¹⁸ Corrigan (1992), 6-7.

¹⁹ Corrigan (1992), 7.

Chapter one

Typology and tropology: the topical significance of biblical events

The present chapter will examine a pattern of thinking that has shaped to a large extent the iconophile message of ninth-century marginal psalter illustration, and will be detected in many of the miniatures examined throughout the thesis. According to this pattern, biblical events built around the conflict of good and evil work as references to the history of the Church, and most specifically to the confrontation between iconophiles and iconoclasts. Some of the most famous miniatures of the Chludov Psalter offer a clear insight to the way this pattern works.

On folio 67r of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 1), Psalm 68:22 “They gave me also gall for my food and made me drink vinegar for my thirst”, is illustrated with the Crucifixion in juxtaposition to an image of iconoclasts whitewashing an icon of Jesus.²⁰ The illustration of verse 68:22 with Christ’s Passion is inspired by *Matthew* 27:34,²¹ and by various Psalm commentaries,²² that consider this passage a reference to the Saviour’s suffering on the cross. Equally, the correlation between the Crucifixion and the destruction of Christ’s icons is found in iconophile literature, where the mistreatment of holy images of Jesus in the hands of heretics is often perceived in terms of a second passion.²³ This illustration presents therefore a

²⁰ All the Old Testament quotations are according to the Septuagint edition. The English translation is taken from *The Septuagint with Apocrypha*, ed. Brenton (1997) – where the numbering of psalm verses is often different from the Septuagint by one number, since the titles of the psalms that are counted as verse 1 in the Septuagint, in this edition are unnumbered. E.g., Psalm 68:22 is recorded as Psalm 68:21). The translations of the New Testament quotations are according to the *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, ed. Marshall (1976).

²¹ Walter (1986), 272.

²² Origen, *In psalmos*, PG 12, 1516B; Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 749; Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 312A; Pseudo-Athanasios, *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 925D; Didymos, *In psalmos*, ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 81-82, §717 (PG 39, 1457A); Asterios, *In psalmos*, ed. Richard (1956), 134:22-23; Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1169; Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1409; Hesychios, *In psalmos*, PG 93, 1232.

²³ Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 24-32, quoting the crucifixion of Christ’s icon by the Jews; the same quotation in Theodore the Studite’s *Antirrheticus II*, PG 99, 365 (trans. Roth [1981], 55 [§19]), and *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 800-8001 (epistle 532:148-171), cf. 338 (215:29-

complex but theologically conventional piece of visual exegesis, constructed through the interrelation of three different levels: the Old Testament text is linked to a New Testament images, which in turn is related to the topical circumstances of ninth century Church history. Behind this transition from one focal point to the other lies an analogical way of thinking that detects in all three levels of comparison a similar case of confrontation between good and evil, virtue and sin.

The same pattern of thinking can be observed also on folio 51v of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 3). Psalm 51:9 “Behold the man who made not God his help; but trusted in the abundance of his wealth, and strengthened himself in his vanity” is illustrated by the New Testament episode of St Peter trampling on Simon Magus, in juxtaposition to the iconophile patriarch Nikephoros treading on the iconoclast John the Grammarian (as symbolical of the triumph of Orthodoxy over heresy in ninth-century ecclesiastical history). The wording of Psalm 51:9 offers adequate justification for the representation of Simon, who according to *Acts* 8:9-24 attempted to purchase from St Peter the power to heal.²⁴ In Early Christian and Byzantine religious texts Simon is considered the first heretic of the Christian Church.²⁵ In iconophile sources, iconoclasts, and sometimes John the Grammarian in particular, are repeatedly compared to him and accused for their love of money, a fact that justifies the representation of John as the “second Simon”, according to the inscription on folio 51v of the Chludov Psalter.²⁶

A further example of the confrontation between good and evil by setting Old Testament text and New Testament imagery against ninth-century topical allusions is

32), 459 (315:19-31). Similar ideas in Patriarch Nikephoros’ *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), p. 178 (§95:39-43); *Adversus Constantinum Caballinum*, PG 95, 33A-336B (trans. by Corrigan [1992], 30-31, commented in n. 23); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 182:823-183:835; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 145:25-27 (§44), 159:22-23 (§57); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 76 (§14:47-50). See also Corrigan (1992), 32-33, n. 31; Gouillard (1969), 3.

²⁴ Corrigan (1992), 27.

²⁵ Examples in: Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VI, 633B; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 356E, 709C; Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1142E-1143A; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 161B, 281A, 285-288, PG 42, 853CD; Patriarch Germanos, *De haeresibus*, PG 98, 41A; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 373:14-15.

²⁶ The inscription reads ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗΣ ΥΠΟΔΕΙΚΝΟΙΩΝ ΙΑΝΝΗΝ ΤΟΝ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΝ ΣΙΜΟΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΚΟΝΟΜΑΧ (Patriarch Nikephoros showing Iannes the second Simon and iconoclast – Ščepkina [1977]). John the Grammarian is called “another Simon” (and the iconoclasts are called “simoniacs”) by George the Monk, *Chronikon*, Wirth (1978), 778:11-15; and he is mentioned next to Simon in the *Canon in erectione SS. Imaginum*, PG 99, 1772C (see also Corrigan [1992], 28-29). For the accusation of simony formulated against him see Gero (1975), 27, n. 41. Simony is condemned at length (obviously in relation to iconoclasts) in the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 462-475. At least five of its twenty two canons (the 4th, 13th, 15th, 16th, 19th) treat issues related to the clergy’s abuses regarding economical profits and luxury, *Mansi* XIII, 421, 431, 434, 435-438.

found on folio 67v of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 2). Psalm 68:28 “Add iniquity to their iniquity; and let them not come into thy righteousness” is illustrated with the scene of Jews bribing the guards of Christ’s Tomb to lie about his Resurrection, juxtaposed to iconoclasts buying and shelling Church offices. The depiction of the New Testament episode reported in *Matthew* 28:11-15 is justified by psalm commentaries,²⁷ while its juxtaposition to the simoniac iconoclasts can be once more associated to iconophile polemics comparing these heretics to Jews and accusing them for their love of money.²⁸

For the Byzantine Christian this model of the eternal conflict between light and darkness runs through the entire history of mankind. A constant spiritual war is believed to evolve along the lines of God’s divine plan for human salvation, from the Old to the New Testament and beyond it to the history of the Christian Church. If episodes from all three of these historical periods prefigure or reflect one another, it is exactly because they all follow the eternal pattern of good versus evil, of order versus disorder. This pattern is one of the cornerstones on which is based typology, the dominant model of theological thought in Early Christian and Byzantine culture.²⁹

Today, scholars term “typological” the scriptural exegesis of Early Christian and Byzantine theology, in which Old Testament events are interpreted as “types” and shadows of the truth accomplished in the New Testament through the Incarnation of the Logos.³⁰ However, a “typological” interrelation is also constructed in patristic literature between the biblical story and the history of the Church, since the confrontation of good and evil taking place in the Old and New Testament is believed to repeat itself in the life of the Church. The typological relation between the Old and the New Testament works on a mystical and dogmatic level, concerning the advent of Christ and the institution of the Church. In this case the Old Testament prefigures what the New Testament fulfils. The typological relation between the Bible and the life of the Church works on a spiritual and moral level, setting up the examples of

²⁷ Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 312C; Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1173B (for Psalm 68:27).

²⁸ Corrigan (1992), 29-30. See also p. 102, n. 322 below.

²⁹ The prominence of this model of thinking in Byzantine theology will be demonstrated by the iconophile texts and interpretations presented in the following chapters. See also Taft (1980-81), 59-65, n. 69 for basic bibliography; Danielou (1960). For an analysis of typology exemplified by specific cases one can turn to Lampe – Woolcombe (1957); Danielou (1960a). See Maguire (1988), for examples from Byzantine literature and art from which he argues that comparison was a basic form of expression in Byzantine society, especially among the educated members of the higher social class, who were particularly familiar with and appreciative of rhetorical *synkrisis*.

³⁰ Examples by Danielou (1950); Danielou (1960a).

piety and faith that Christianity should follow. In this case the Old and the New Testament provide types of the struggle of good against evil that the Church continuously imitates.³¹

As it will be argued below, this typological approach of Church history bears strong theological connotations, which reflect the idea that Christianity is the New Israel. It does not carry, however, the dogmatic and Christological significance attributed to the typological relation between the Old and the New Testament. For this reason I have opted to use the term “Christological typology” or “Christological exegesis” to refer to the interpretation of Old Testament scriptures as prophecies of the Incarnation, and speak about “theological arguments” when referring to iconophile statements on dogmatic issues concerning Christ, the icons, the relation of Old and New Testament etc. On the contrary, I use the term “typological expressions / interrelations” and so on, to refer to the analogies drawn in the literary sources and in the visual material between biblical events and the history of the Church. When this typological reading of the scriptures is related to the life of Christians as individuals (and not to the life of the Church as a collective body mystically united with Christ), then it is specifically termed tropological.³² The typological approach as defined above comprises the tropological one, likewise to the Church that comprises the individual believers. For this reason, in the following chapters I will mostly make reference to the typological significance of ninth-century marginal psalter illustration as alluding to Church history, with the implication that in this reference the tropological reading is also applicable, especially since tropology will be shown to have particular significance in the exegesis of the psalter.

According to the model of typological thinking outlined above, the iconophile-iconoclast conflict (in other words that of Orthodoxy and heresy) is a typical and critical instance of the perennial and fierce opposition between good and evil, comparable to other such conflicts between light and darkness that took place in human history. Since it concerns the Church and the salvation of the people of God, it can be aptly paralleled to events from the Bible, considered as the historical past and the preparation of the way to the New Israel, the world of Orthodox Christianity. Indeed, the association of Old and New Testament events with the iconoclast crisis of the eight and ninth century is a recurring theme in iconophile literature – as will

³¹ Cf. Taft (1980-81), 59-61.

³² Taft (1980-81), p. 60.

become evident in the next two chapters. In these texts, biblical episodes like David's victory over Goliath, or Christ's exorcism miracles, are seen as analogies of the contemporary controversy between iconophiles and iconoclasts. Consequently, the illustration of the same biblical events in the ninth-century marginal Psalters may be correctly viewed as alluding to the iconoclastic crisis and to the final victory of Orthodoxy.

This pattern of analogy between Church history and biblical events, whether expressed in literary or visual form, is not simply a rhetorical scheme or a metaphorical embellishment. On the contrary, it conveys a profound religious meaning with a strong polemical flavour.³³ By comparing the iconophile victory to such Old Testament stories as the Exodus from Egypt and the triumph of David over Goliath, or to New Testament events like Christ's miracles and Resurrection, the iconophiles underline the paramount importance of the victory of Orthodoxy for the salvation of God's chosen people, the Christians, and assert the place of icon-veneration in Church history as continuation of the biblical tradition. Consequently, they emphatically declare that this is a divinely blessed victory of good over evil; and that contemporary Orthodoxy is supported by the Bible. At the same time, they condemn iconoclasts in the strongest possible way by equating them with all the worst manifestations of evil in the "history of mankind", from the Pharaoh and the Philistines that fought the Old Israel, to the Pharisees, the demons and Hades that Christ confronted for the salvation of the New Israel. In short, this juxtaposition between biblical story and Church history is a constant feature of Early Christian and Byzantine thought and literature (and not of course confined to iconophile writings of the eight and ninth century alone), exactly because it reflects the central Christian concept that the ecumenical Church of the believers in Christ was the New Israel that had replaced the Old one, with superior glory and grace bestowed from on High. This belief was particularly deeply rooted in the mentality of the Byzantines, who considered themselves the new chosen people of God, their Christian empire the New Israel, their emperor a second Moses or David and their capital the New Jerusalem.³⁴

³³ Cf. Cutler (1992).

³⁴ Already from the time of Constantine the Great, mainly through the writings of Eusebios, the Christian people of the Roman empire are thought to be the New Israel and their emperor a second Moses. (See Dagron [1996], 141 ff., 201 ff; Grabar [1936], 95-97. For cases of visual typological panegyric of this kind, see p. 48, n. 78 below). From the end of the fifth century Constantinople starts being mentioned as the New Jerusalem, and the accumulation of relics from the Holy Land, particularly

This Byzantine viewing of its past needs to be taken into account in the interpretation of both art and literature. The Old Testament is taken as a ‘type’ for Byzantine history –as a kind of shadowy prefiguration of Byzantine events– so that the history of the Byzantine empire is perceived as the history of the Spiritual Israel that began with the New Testament. This idea was so pervasive that it appears not only in religious texts, but also in imperial panegyrics and historical treatises.³⁵ In these texts, events in the life of the Church, in imperial politics or other fields are often related to biblical episodes. The consequence of this comparative manner of thinking is that conflicts in Byzantine history (whether between Orthodoxy and heresy, between an emperor and his rivals, between the empire and its “barbarous” enemies, etc.) can be directly portrayed as moral battles between good and evil. It is exactly this comparison between the present and the biblical past that emphasizes the belief of the Byzantines that they were the New Israel that had replaced the Old one in unbroken continuity and in absolute respect of tradition, with the difference that in their new world theory the Letter of the Law had been substituted by the Grace of the Spirit through the Incarnation of the Logos as the genuine Messiah.³⁶

It is in the psalter that Byzantines found the best opportunities from all the books of the Bible to illustrate key Old and New Testament confrontations of good and evil and relate them to contemporary events, giving this idea of continuity in the history of the New, Spiritual Israel. These exceptional opportunities, fully realised in the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters, are due to the fact that the psalms contain in combination a particularly large number of references both to the Old Testament (Jewish history) and to the New Testament (prophesies of Christ’s Incarnation).³⁷ In other words, they are exceptionally appropriate for typological exegesis, which sees two or more historical events of different epochs in the salvation history as being related to each other. In this case, both the Christological typology between the Old and the New Testament, and the ecclesiological typology between

under the Macedonian dynasty in the Middle Byzantine period, further promotes this contestation (Flusin [2000]). See also Lampe (1961), 671, “*Τεροσόλυμα*”, 4; 678, “*Ισραήλ*”, 4-5.

³⁵ For example, see Anagnostakis (2001).

³⁶ Cutler (1992), 47 ff., speaks of the literary and artistic statements of Byzantine culture “in which a biblical or other distant event is depicted not only as a direct allusion to a current concern but as a demonstration of ancient values” and as a way of promoting this “illusion of continuity” that the Byzantines had for their history. He notes that this “process of sedimentation –the accumulation of layers of meaning” in Byzantine art “is more obvious between the ninth and the eleventh century than in the following era”.

³⁷ Athanasios, *Ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum*, PG 27, 12B-17C.

the Bible and the life of the Church, can be applied. Furthermore, the confrontation between virtuous and sinners is the main theme of the psalms,³⁸ not only on a historical (biblical) level, but also on a general, impersonal level beyond time and place, that can be related to the life of every Christian reading the psalter and recognising in the conflicts described there his or her own everyday experiences. This personal approach to the psalm text corresponds to an equally important level of interpretation, known as tropological exegesis (relating the typological sense of the scripture to the life of each individual believer, as another aspect of the Christian belief in the transition from the Old to the New Israel).³⁹

Tropological exegesis was a normal procedure in the reading of the psalter in Byzantine society, and it offers an explanation for the exceptional popularity of this text.⁴⁰ This attitude is already evident in patristic sources, and prominent Church fathers, for example Sts Basil the Great, Athanasios the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Chrysostom, insist in their commentaries on the psalms on the edifying importance of this personal approach to the holy text. They consider the psalter a mirror reflecting the universal order that should also regulate every Christian's life.⁴¹ They advise their audience to relate the confrontation of good and evil that is so omnipresent in the psalms to their own lives. Only in this way, they suggest, can the Christian comprehend the deeper spiritual message of the holy text, which can be a source of moral guidance and support in any situation, whether of peril and weakness, or salvation and exaltation.⁴² It is clear from patristic writings that a tropological interpretation of the psalms was not just an option, but the proper way of reading them.

This approach to the psalter was continuously recorded and disseminated through the numerous codices with *catena* comments on the psalms that circulated widely in Byzantium. In them, various patristic references to the tropological

³⁸ Corrigan (1992), 112-113.

³⁹ Taft (1980-81), 59-65. For the illustration of Western psalters under a point of view that emphasises the confrontation between good and evil inherent in the psalms and prominent in Christian mentality in general see, for example, Openshaw (1989), and Openshaw (1993).

⁴⁰ For the extensive familiarity with and use of the Psalter in Byzantium see Corrigan (1992), 4, notes 14-15; also Lamb (1962), 27-30 for the role of the Psalter in the post-Nicene Church.

⁴¹ Gregory of Nyssa, *In psalmos*, PG 44, 440B-444, 484A, 485BC, (trans. Heine [1995], 88, §18; 120, §115; 122, §121-122 respectively).

⁴² Athanasios, *Ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum*, PG 27, 20B-37B; Basil the Great, *In psalmos*, PG 29, 212A-213C; Gregory of Nyssa, *In psalmos*, PG 44, 489B-504A (especially 489CD, 493B, 501C), 569BC, (trans. Heine [1995], 126-135; 184, §194 respectively); John Chrysostom, *In psalmos*, PG 55, 156-158. Also Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 861B (and 937C, 1239BC, 1288C, 1444A for specific psalms, to mention only some examples).

interpretation of the psalter were included not only in the introductory texts, but also in comments on individual psalms.⁴³ Moreover, the application of this tropological approach to the psalter in everyday life is attested by those patristic texts that recommend or record the frequent chanting or recitation of the psalms by Christians of all ages and both sexes, in various places and occasions. Relevant references are not found only in the writings of the early fathers of the Church, like St Gregory of Nyssa, St John Chrysostom, and Theodoret;⁴⁴ they are also included in iconophile sources of the eighth and ninth century. For example, in the second canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, it is stated that all the bishops must know thoroughly the psalter in order to offer appropriate moral guidance and teaching to their flock.⁴⁵ Similarly, in various of his epistles Theodore the Studite advises persecuted iconoclasts to chant the psalms in order to confront their fears and gather courage to continue their struggle.⁴⁶ An important case of psalter illustration designed to support the tropological reading of the psalms is found in the eleventh-century Theodore Psalter – produced in the Studios Monastery for the abbot Michael, using as model a copy of the Chludov Psalter. Many of its miniatures and certain additional texts relate the psalms to the aspirations, the moral standards, and spiritual models that an abbot would set to himself, and create a comparison between him and David – an exemplary leader chosen by God.⁴⁷

⁴³ On the popularity of *catena* codices on the psalms see Dorival (1985), esp. 210. Two such manuscripts that contain the letter of Athanasios of Alexandria to Marcellinos on the interpretation of the psalms (*Ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum*, PG 27, 11-46), a characteristic example of the tropological approach to the psalter, are the following –to mention just a few cases: cod. Vat. gr. 754, folios 15v-25r (dated in the tenth century, based on an archetype of around 700, Dorival [1986-95], II, 243, 281); cod. Par. gr. 146, folios 6v-11r (dated in the tenth-eleventh centuries, based on a Constantinopolitan compilation of psalm commentaries formed before 900, using sources of much earlier dates, Dorival [1986-95], IV, 361, 417-418). Having examined the latter codex in detail, I mention a few cases of specific psalms interpreted tropologically in the comments, as generally referring to situations that every Christian might confront in his or her life: Psalm 3 / folio 28v, Psalm 9 / folio 36v, Psalm 17 / folio 47r, Psalm 27 / folio 61v, Psalm 88:10 / folio 159r, Psalm 101 / folio 174v, Psalm 106 / 189r, Psalm 117 / folio 203r, Psalm 143 / folio 235v. Many more psalms are interpreted tropologically as referring specifically to the Church, to the confrontation of Orthodox and heretics, to the condemnation of impious and to the confutation of heretic beliefs. For example: Psalm 1 / folio 25v, Psalm 3 / folio 28v, Psalm 5:10 / folio 31v, Psalm 7 / folio 33r, Psalm 9:15 / folio 37v, Psalm 22:2 / folio 57r, Psalm 26:12 / folio 61v, Psalm 39:12-13 / folio 82r, Psalm 44:10-15 / folio 89v-90v, Psalm 47:12 / folio 93v, Psalm 57:5 / folio 108r, Psalm 62:11 / folio 115v, Psalm 67:17 / folio 121r, Psalm 67:31 / folio 122v, Psalm 72:27 / folio 133r, 96:11 / folio 172r, Psalm 98:9 / folio 173v, Psalm 101:17 / folio 176r, Psalm 109:1 / folio 195v, Psalm 117:19 / folio 204v.

⁴⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *In psalmos*, PG 44, 437D-440B (trans. Heine [1995], 29-30, §17), *In ascensionem*, PG 46, 689C; John Chrysostom, *In psalmos*, PG 55, 157-158 (identical to PG 55, 537-538 [*spuria in psalmos*]); Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 857A-860A.

⁴⁵ *Mansi* XIII, 420B.

⁴⁶ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 379 (epistle 247:15), 488 (352:8), 571 (410:44), 791-92 (529:13-19).

⁴⁷ Barber (2000), 13-15; Lowden (2000), 15-16; Barber (2000a), with further bibliography.

The iconophiles who commissioned and used the marginal psalters shortly after the triumph of Orthodoxy in 843 were highly ranking Churchmen, certainly familiar with psalm commentaries, and aware of the prominent moral role that the psalter held in Christian life.⁴⁸ It follows that they would read both the text and the imagery of these codices tropologically, and they would inevitably relate them to the conflict of iconoclasts and iconophiles and to the triumph of Orthodoxy that dominated their own lives and period. This approach is immediately clear from the illustration of Psalm 1 in the Chludov Psalter, which sets the model for how the rest of the miniatures in the manuscript should be read. (The beginning of the Pantokrator and the Paris marginal Psalters is not preserved).⁴⁹ Folio 2r (fig. 6) shows a man turning his back on a group of evil-doers, while reading the scriptures below a medallion-like icon of Christ. The inscriptions read *MAKAPIOC* (“blessed”) and *ACEBEIC* (“ungodly”). This imagery illustrates Psalm 1:1-2: “Blessed is the man who has not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, and has not stood in the way of sinners, and has not sat in the seat of evil men. But his pleasure is in the law of the Lord; and in his law will he meditate day and night”. The rest of the psalm describes the rewards of the righteous and the punishment of the sinners, literally represented by the blessed man harvesting fruit, while the wicked are tossed like chaff in the wind.⁵⁰

This composition may suggest that all the righteous men represented in the manuscript follow the example of the first one to appear – shown reading the scriptures below Christ’s icon; they are iconophiles who know that the correct interpretation of the scriptures supports the veneration of icons. Similarly, all the evildoers stand for the iconoclasts who are punished for their blasphemy. This interpretation is supported by the commentary of St Basil, who states that the deeper spiritual meaning of the entire psalter and its didactic importance is revealed in the admonitions of the first psalm.⁵¹ Likewise, one might say that the moral message of the whole psalter illustration is indicated in the image accompanying the first psalm.

The full importance of this image on folio 2r can best be deduced by considering the complete first opening of the manuscript. Folio 1v of the Chludov Psalter, which acts as frontispiece for the whole codex, presents us with the portrait of

⁴⁸ Corrigan (1992), 129-134, 110.

⁴⁹ Dufrenne (1966), 15, 41.

⁵⁰ Corrigan (1992), 14, 31-32, 43.

⁵¹ *In psalmos*, PG 29, 213D-216A. Similar attention on the importance of the first psalm in revealing the moral message of the psalter is paid by Gregory of Nyssa, *In psalmos*, PG 44, 485AB (trans. Heine [1995], 122, §120), and John Chrysostom, *Argumentum psalmorum (spuria)*, PG 55, 533-534.

the author of the psalms, David, playing his psaltery (fig. 5). He is surrounded by four male figures chanting and playing musical instruments. They are reminiscent of the four chanters that according to Eusebios stood in front of the ark, accompanying David in his singing and praise to God.⁵² The king is depicted sitting on a throne, and above him appears an image of Christ in a medallion, similar to the smaller circular icon above the blessed man on folio 2r and to the other icons of Christ in the codex.⁵³ The monumental architectural setting that surrounds David and Christ's icon consists of two columns supporting an arch decorated with a floral motif. This construction may have been intended to allude to the tabernacle. The holy tent of the Jews in which the ark was kept was indeed depicted as consisting of two columns supporting an arch in some Christian and Jewish artefacts of Late Antiquity (figs 7-9).⁵⁴ It was represented as a ciborium in the Byzantine illustrated octateuchs dating from the eleventh to the thirteenth century (fig. 10, 13).⁵⁵ It was schematically rendered as a rectangle with an arched top in the ninth-century cod. Vat. gr. 699 (figs 11-12), and in the eleventh-century cod. Sinait. gr. 1186, both copies of the *Christian Topography* by Kosmas Indikopleustes.⁵⁶ The outline of the architectural setting on folio 1v of the Chludov Psalter is also reminiscent of the ark, often represented in Byzantine art as a cabinet with rounded lid (figs 13-16).⁵⁷ This architectural setting may be therefore related to the aforementioned comment of Eusebios, stating that David and his four chanters sung in front of the ark, which was contained in the tabernacle.

⁵² *In psalmos*, PG 23, 73AB.

⁵³ Folios 3v, 4r (fig. 145), 12r, 15v, 23v (fig. 20), 48v, 51v (fig. 3), 67r (fig. 1), 86r, 90v (fig. 215), 97v.

⁵⁴ An example from the Christian realm comes from the Basilewsky pyxis of the sixth century (Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg, fig. 9). The tabernacle consists of two columns supporting an arch. This structure is very similar in form to the Torah niche, and to the depiction of the tabernacle in the middle of the Temple of Jerusalem that appears above the niche, in the synagogue of Dura Europos, middle of the third century (fig. 7). It is also comparable to the tabernacle framed by the façade of the Jewish Temple in a sixth-century floor mosaic from a Synagogue in Beth Shean, now in the Israel Museum of Jerusalem (fig. 8). See Clair (1984), esp. 25, figs 6, 14; Weitzmann – Kessler (1990), 155, 162-163, figs 193, 199; *Age of Spirituality* (1979), 375-76, cat. no. 343.

⁵⁵ Weitzmann – Bernabò (1999), 179, figs 774-777, etc. See also Brubaker (1981).

⁵⁶ For example, on folios 89r and 108r of cod. Vat. gr. 699 (figs 11-12) the entire cosmos appears in the shape of the tabernacle, rectangular with rounded top (Kessler [1993], 62-63, figs 2-3). Likewise on folios 65v and 145r of cod. Sinait. gr. 1186; and on folio 86v the tabernacle itself is shown as a rectangle with arched top (Weitzmann – Galavaris [1990], 53, 60, 57, figs 134, 170, 152).

⁵⁷ In the Pentateuch cycles of the six known illustrated Byzantine octateuchs the ark has a rounded lid (figs 13-14) – while the type of ark with gabbled top appears in the Joshua cycle of the same codices and in other works of art. The ark is shown with rounded lid also in illustrated copies of the *Christian Topography*, for example, folio 48r of cod. Vat. gr. 699, and folios 82r (fig. 15) and 89r of cod. Sinait. 1186 of the eleventh century. On folio 69r of the latter codex the cosmos is depicted in the shape of the ark – rectangular box with rounded lid – and Christ's image in a medallion appears at its upper part (fig. 16). See Weitzmann – Bernabò (1999), 175, 228, figs 750-753 etc., figs 1159 ff.; Revel-Neher (1995), 407-409; Weitzmann – Galavaris (1990), 54, 56-57, figs 139, 149, 153; Weitzmann – Kessler (1990), 74; Brubaker (1981).

This full-page frontispiece is carefully chosen. The representation of an icon of Jesus above David on the opening page of the psalter must have suggested that the content of the psalms refers not only to the Incarnation of the Logos prophesied by the psalmist and forefather, but also to the legitimacy and sacredness of the holy icons of Christ, validated from the fact of his Incarnation. Moreover, the depiction of Christ's icon inside an architectural setting that could stand for the tabernacle, might be taken to allude to the replacement of the Old Covenant by the New through the Incarnation of the Logos, which is here signified by the icon.⁵⁸ Consequently, the miniature makes reference to the strongest argument of iconophile polemics, according to which the representation of Christ in icons is a result and at the same time a proof of the Incarnation.⁵⁹ Moreover, the composition recalls another basic iconophile argument, which states that while in the Old Testament God was revealed indirectly to men through prophesies –like the ones contained in the psalter–, and through types –like the tabernacle, the ark and other holy objects–, after the Incarnation he was seen face to face in the person of Christ and consequently in the icons that reproduced his likeness.⁶⁰ The same iconophile arguments often recur in the miniatures of the ninth-century marginal Psalters.⁶¹

The frontispiece of the Chludov Psalter on folio 1v instantly recalls the Christological references of the psalms and their significance for the justification of Christ's icons. It declares the importance of using imagery in the presentation of the psalm text, and explains why the depiction of Christ's life on earth will be a recurrent feature in the illustration of the whole manuscript. The figure of the blessed man reading the scriptures below an icon of Christ on folio 2r conveys the same message.

⁵⁸ Other cases in which the tabernacle is represented in a context that alludes to the replacement of the Old Covenant by the New: on the Basilewsky pyxis (n. 54 above, fig. 9) a Gospel rather than a Torah is depicted inside the tabernacle (Weitzmann – Kessler [1990], 163; Clair [1984] for the allusions to the New Testament through scenes of the Old in the entire decoration of this pyxis). In most miniatures of the Byzantine illustrated Octateuchs the tabernacle is transformed into a Christian altar with a ciborium (n. 55 above, figs 10, 13). On the twelfth-century icon in the monastery of St Catherine on Mount Sinai that depicts the Virgin “Kykkotissa” surrounded by prophets, a construction almost identical to that on folio 1v of the Chludov Psalter –two columns supporting an arch– frames the figure of the Theotokos holding the Child (fig. 17). Given the complex references of this icon to the dogma of the Incarnation and to Old Testament types of Mary (Mouriki [1990], p. 105, n. 27), it is most probable that the architectural framing alludes to the tabernacle containing the true ark, the Mother of God, holding the living law, Jesus Christ. The inscription held by David on the left border of the icon identifies the Virgin with the ark (Psalm 131:8 “Arise, O Lord, into thy rest; thou, and the ark of thy holiness”), which appears next to the prophet in the round-topped type, bearing a cross.

⁵⁹ Parry (1996), 70-80; Giakalis (1994), 101-103; Brubaker (1989a), 33-39.

⁶⁰ Parry (1996), 125-132; Giakalis (1994), 78-81, 103-106; Brubaker (1989a), 40-42; Lafontaine-Dosogne (1968).

⁶¹ Corrigan (1992), 49-89, with previous bibliography.

Together the two opening pages of the Chludov Psalter (folios 1v-2r, figs 5-6) set the tone for the whole illustration of the codex, clearly indicating its polemical iconophile orientation. The frequent appearance of icons as objects in various miniatures of the Psalter,⁶² and the five compositions with overtly anti-iconoclastic subject,⁶³ further enhance the iconophile perspective of the illustration. Similar subjects also appear in the Pantokrator Psalter,⁶⁴ and in the Paris marginal Psalters,⁶⁵ although to a smaller extent –partly because of their more fragmentary state, especially in the case of the Paris marginal Psalter.⁶⁶ In view of this, the interpreter must be alert to the fact that iconophile allusions may be far more ubiquitous in these manuscripts than in the overtly anti-iconoclastic representations. It is the aim of this thesis to show that this is indeed the case, and that the levels of iconophile thinking in their illustrations are even deeper and more sophisticated than appears at first sight, or has been already recognised in the previous literature.

One of the methods that will be employed in order to disclose the extensive iconophile allusions in the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters, especially in the Chludov Psalter, will be based on the detection and typological interpretation of confrontations between opposed forces. To be more specific, the illustration of the first psalm and the five compositions that openly condemn iconoclasts in the Chludov Psalter follow the pattern of directly juxtaposing good and evil, pious and impious, Orthodox and heretics, or at least depict iconoclasts as sinister representatives of evil. Just as the blessed man who acknowledges the icon of Christ is juxtaposed to the impious on folio 2r (fig. 6), so the saintly iconophile Patriarch Nikephoros is contrasted with the demonised iconoclasts on folio 23v (fig. 20), and directly confronts one of them on folio 51v (where, as mentioned already, he tramples on John the Grammarian like apostle Peter does on Simon Magus, fig. 3).

⁶² Besides Christ's icons mentioned on n. 53 above, there are also three icons of the Virgin and Child on folios 44r, 64r, 86v and an icon of St Paul on folio 65r (figs 102, 184, 189, 111). One more circular icon of Christ has been removed from folio 93v.

⁶³ Folios 23v, 35v, 51v, 67r, 67v. The last three folios (figs 1-3) are described on pp. 30-32 above; folio 23v (fig. 20) on pp. 49-50 below; folio 35v (fig. 4) on pp. 159-160 below.

⁶⁴ Patriarch Nikephoros trampling on the iconoclast Patriarch Theodotos and the iconoclast emperor Leo V, next to a depiction of the iconoclast council of 815, on folio 16r (fig. 18); the iconoclast John the Grammarian arguing with David over the nature of idols as opposed to the holy objects of the Temple, folio 165r (fig. 19); Christ's icon on folios 16r (fig. 18), 93v, 114r (fig. 183), 119v, 138r, and on folios 3v and 4v of cod. Petropolitanus 265, formerly belonging to the Pantokrator Psalter; icon of the Virgin and Child on folios 93v, and 121r (fig. 190); icon of St Paul on folio 85r. Described by Dufrenne (1966), 21-22, 27, 28, 30-35.

⁶⁵ Christ's icon on folios 3v, 5v, 7r, and on folio 9r, now mutilated. Described by Dufrenne (1966), 43-44.

⁶⁶ See p. 28, n. 16 above.

The iconoclasts on folios 67r and 67v are compared to the Jews who crucified Christ and bribed the guards of his tomb respectively (figs 1-2). On folio 35v the iconoclast John the Grammarian is depicted as an embodiment of evil, being directly inspired by a demon (fig. 4). Likewise, on folio 16r of the Pantokrator Psalter patriarch Nikephoros tramples on two iconoclasts, emperor and patriarch, and refuses to sit with the participants of the iconoclast council of 815 (fig. 18). Among them, the heretic John the Grammarian is depicted as demonised, with wild hair standing on end, as on folio 165r, where he is confronted by the psalmist himself (fig. 19). The recurring pattern of confrontation between iconophile virtue and iconoclast impiety in the above cases suggests that a similar polemical overtone could be implied in other miniatures, where the Old or New Testament episodes depicted have no obvious visual connection with the conflict of Orthodoxy and heresy, but represent analogous cases of the conflict between good and evil.

To sum up this approach, the text of the Psalter offered significant opportunities for the execution of an overtly polemical iconophile cycle of illustrations, and it is not surprising that it was in such books that we find the winners of 843 to have chosen their arena against the iconoclasts. On the one hand, the psalm prophecies concerning the Incarnation were illustrated with the corresponding New Testament episodes, alluding to theological iconophile arguments that appeared even more valid in the light of their association with the venerable Old Testament tradition.⁶⁷ On the other hand, it was possible to relate the omnipresent conflict of good and evil that is found in the text of the psalms to the iconophile controversy in two ways, both equally valid. The typological approach saw in major Old and New Testament confrontations an equivalent of the recent Church-history crisis, since they were all analogous moments of conflict in the path of the Spiritual Israel towards salvation. The tropological approach considered the same major events as didactic equivalents and moral analogies of the conflict between iconoclast heresy and iconophile Orthodoxy as experienced by the users of the psalters.

The practically unlimited possibilities for relating the psalm narration of conflicts between good and evil to dogmatic or moral confrontations in Church history had been exploited long before the ninth century by the commentators of the psalter. For example, Didymos, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret often interpreted

⁶⁷ See Corrigan (1992), 62 ff., and chapter three of the present thesis.

various psalm verses as allusions to evil heretics, or to the virtuous Orthodox, while some times they even used the psalm prophesies of Christ's Incarnation as arguments against heresy.⁶⁸ A similar apologetic use of quotations from the psalms made its appearance in various theological writings concerned with the definition of the Orthodox dogma and its defence against heresy or Judaism, including texts of iconophile polemics of the eight and ninth century.⁶⁹ Moreover, prominent Church Fathers, such as St John Chrysostom, St Athanasios and St Ambrose of Milan, used the psalms in times of heretical (Arian) upheaval in order to encourage and keep their congregation united.⁷⁰ By emphasising and elaborating the chanting of psalms in the church, they probably intended to relate the confrontations described in the psalter to those the Orthodox Christians were experiencing at the time. It was a way of pleading for God's help, and celebrating in advance the victory of good over evil according to the examples and the guidance of analogous biblical events narrated in the psalms.

It is also indicative that the second canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Council judges the morality and the orthodoxy of the faithful, and especially of the clergy, first

⁶⁸ For example, see Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), I, 156 (§65, Psalm 9:24), 165 (§76, Psalm 11:2), 175-76 (§91, Psalm 15:1-2), 191 (§114, Psalm 17:11), 195 (§121, Psalm 17:17-19), 196 (§125, Psalm 17:22), 221-22 (§170-71, Psalm 20:10-11), 251 (§234, Psalm 25:8-9), 254-55 (§240, Psalm 26:11), 286 (§319, Psalm 33:21), 296 (§349, Psalm 35:9), 304 (§372, Psalm 36:37-40), 328 (§433, Psalm 41:11-12), II, 6 (§564, Psalm 52:6), 31 (§616, Psalm 59:3), 47 (§645-6, Psalm 63:3-6), 50 (§652, Psalm 64:2-3), 51 (§655, Psalm 64:5), 62 (§681, Psalm 67:2), 73 (§702, Psalm 67:31), 116 (§788, Psalm 75:5-7), 119 (§791, Psalm 75:13), 132-33 (§816-7, Psalm 78:1-4), 138 (§828, Psalm 79:6-14), 182 (§901, Psalm 90:3), 191 (§913, Psalm 91:13), 223-24 (§968-9, Psalm 101:4-6/14), 264 (§1056, Psalm 111:10), 273 (§1073, Psalm 117:5-9), 298 (§1150, Psalm 118:176), 299 (§1155, Psalm 121:2-4), 300 (§1157, Psalm 121:6-7), 302 (§1162, 124:2), 310 (§1177, Psalm 128:5-8), 353 (§1267, Psalm 145:7-8), 360 (§1279, Psalm 147:8-9); Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 781D, 932B, 949C, 1036D-1037A, 1156B, 1157CD, 1189A, 1217C; Theodore, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 897B, 964D, 1157D-1160B, 1205D, 1297C, 1385C, 1525C, 1849A. More passages survive where the commentators consider the psalm verses references to the Church, without specific mention on heresy, (see p. 213, n. 802 below). From all the above it becomes clear that the interpretation of the psalter in relation to the history of the Church and the contemporary life of the Christian flock is very frequent.

⁶⁹ For the use of the psalms in anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim literature see Corrigan (1992), 43-44, 80. For example, the ninth-century *Disputatio adversus Iudaeos* mentioned by Corrigan makes frequent use of the psalms to condemn the Hebrews, and especially to prove that Christ's Incarnation was prophesied in the psalter, PG 89, 1208B/D, 1209B-1212A, 1216C, 1217AB, 1220BC, 1229, 1232, 1236BD, 1244. The commonplace employment of certain psalms in polemical literature is attested, for example, by the use of psalm 57:5 "Their venom is like that of a serpent; as that of a deaf asp, that stops her ears" as a reference to heretics in the *Viae Dux* by Anastasios of Sinai, ed. Uthermann (1981), 99 (VI.1:122-26); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 156:78; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 176:27-178:1 (§78). Another indicative example is the frequent typological-tropological or dogmatic use of psalms in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787: *Mansi* XII, 959C, 1084C, 1086C, 1126D-E, 1130B, 1144C, 1145B, *Mansi* XIII, 4B, 9A, 21E, 48E, 55D, 107B, 123A-A, 130C, 205D, 207B, 210A, 214B, 215D, 221A, 227A, D, 233A, 287A, 291A, 313C, 315B, 325A, 352B, 354D, 356E, 357A, 360E, 364D, 420B, 425A, 428C, 441C, 445E, 448D, 453A, 461C, 468C, 476C, 481C. See also Grabar (1984), 227. See also pp. 130-31 below.

⁷⁰ See Moran (1986), 25; Lamb (1962), 29.

of all by their thorough knowledge of the psalter, because “by chanting the psalms we take the side of God”.⁷¹ Especially those prelates who wish to become bishops must know the entire psalter (evidently by heart), and fully comprehend its deeper religious meaning, to be able to teach their congregation and their clergy. Their competence and knowledge in this field is to be examined by the archbishop (who must know the psalter at least as well as they do). It is worth mentioning that in this canon the psalter is referred to first of all, before “the holy canons, the gospels, the epistles and all the holy scripture”.⁷² In this context it is possible that our manuscripts were used or given as special gifts by high-ranking clergymen to others of their rank, as proof of their Orthodox faith.

According to this approach, almost all illustrations of the ninth-century marginal psalters that visualized the perennial struggle between good and evil narrated in the psalms, may be seen as allusions to the conflict between iconophiles and iconoclasts, who were considered the embodiment *par excellence* of contemporary virtue and sin by the high-ranking clergy responsible for the production of these manuscripts. Aside from their preoccupation with the victory of icon veneration over iconoclasm, these men were of course also interested in the predominance of Christian moral standards and beliefs in a more general sense. This is another aspect of their thinking that can be found in a close analysis of the iconography.⁷³ Not every single miniature of these psalters is necessarily an expression of iconophile polemics, although orthodoxy in general is a recurrent interest. The miniatures of the ninth-century psalters no doubt incorporated a pre-existing visual tradition.⁷⁴ They were also influenced by liturgical practice, or specific homiletic and hymnographic texts that seem to have conditioned certain iconographic choices, just to mention two other crucial factors that will be briefly examined in the present thesis.

Nevertheless, for the clergy who created and used these psalters the iconophile victory was obviously a major concern, as is quite evident by the recurrent appearance

⁷¹ *Mansi* XIII, 420B.

⁷² *Mansi* XIII, 420C.

⁷³ For example, the praise of charity in the miniatures illustrating psalms 36:26 and 111:9 on folios 35r and 116r of the Chludov Psalter (figs 219, 226), as discussed by Antonopoulos (1981). However, these miniatures can be also considered to have anti-iconoclast connotations, in relation to the condemnation of iconoclast simony on folios 35v, 51v and 67v, where John the Grammarian or anonymous iconoclasts appear as iniquitous money-lovers and simoniacs; see pp. 159-60 below.

⁷⁴ Corrigan (1992), 8-26, with previous bibliography.

of icons and the vehement condemnation of iconoclasts in several miniatures throughout the manuscripts. This in itself is an indication that the illustration of these codices as a whole may have been designed and interpreted from an iconophile point of view, even if this is not immediately evident today. The typological and tropological approach to the miniatures of the ninth-century marginal psalters offers a way for trying to understand how the creators and contemporary viewers of these manuscripts considered these illustrated texts in relation to their iconophile preoccupations. Obviously, a holistic recreation and application of their attitude to the illustrations is impossible, today's cultural background being completely different. In some cases, however, certain passageways survive by means of which one might attempt to reconstruct the significance of a miniature for its original cultural environment.

The best possibilities of a profound analysis of this kind are present when the Old and New Testament scenes depicted in the psalters are also mentioned in iconophile literature as typological and tropological references to events of the iconoclastic controversy. When the same exegesis (reference to the confrontation between Orthodoxy and heresy) is applied to a biblical event even in other texts of Byzantine literature, its typological interpretation in the illustration of the psalters appears reinforced, as the visual expression of a long literary tradition not confined to iconophile sources. Sometimes the anti-iconoclastic interpretation of a miniature is further corroborated by evidence from other illustrations in the same codex, or by the existence of rare iconographic and compositional characteristics in some well-known Old and New Testament episodes. The presence of obvious peculiarities in the iconography and structure of such scenes can, at times, indicate some particular iconophile connotation. Yet another factor that can reinforce the validity of an iconophile interpretation for a miniature in the ninth-century marginal psalters is the place of that scene in the tradition of psalter illustration. If it is not depicted in the Utrecht, the Stuttgart or the Bristol Psalter, -which are thought to reflect sources predating the ninth century- then it is probable that the theme was freshly introduced in the post-iconoclast Byzantine marginal psalters.⁷⁵ One of the reasons for such an

⁷⁵ The Utrecht Psalter (A.D. 816-823), published by De Wald (1930), and the Stuttgart Psalter (around 820-830), published by De Wald (1930a), are Western manuscripts thought to have Early Christian models that can be related with the pre-iconoclast tradition of Byzantine psalter illustration. The early eleventh-century Bristol Psalter is a Byzantine codex closely related to the Pantokrator Psalter, but also thought to reflect a source predating the ninth century (see p. 26, n. 7 above). For the use of these three

addition could be the polemically iconophile significance of the scene in the eyes of its contemporary audience.

The Old Testament miniatures examined in the following chapter demonstrate some applications of the typological and tropological approach to ninth-century psalter illustration adumbrated above.

psalters in the reconstruction of the pre-iconoclastic Byzantine psalter illustration see Corrigan (1992), 8-26.

Chapter two

Old Testament scenes: A typological approach

This chapter offers an analysis of some Old Testament scenes in the ninth-century marginal psalters, using the typological approach as already outlined. The first section examines the illustration of Psalm 151 in the Chludov Psalter, where David kills the lion and the bear and beheads Goliath.⁷⁶ The proposed interpretation is supported by comparison with some other miniatures of the codex, demonstrating similar iconographic or compositional characteristics. The second section analyses some scenes depicting key events in Jewish history, such as the Exodus, the captivity to the Babylonians, and the martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees under Antiochos Epiphanis. In both sections the miniatures are selected as characteristic cases of conflict between opposing forces, extensively used in Byzantine literature (including iconophile texts) as typological allusions to the life of the Church. Based on this rich literary tradition, as well as on the iconographic and compositional characteristics of the miniatures, I shall attempt to disclose the iconophile connotations that this imagery carried for the producers and first users of the three ninth-century marginal psalters. The David scenes are examined first of all, because they seem to offer the clearest instances to which this typological approach to the Old Testament can be applied.

⁷⁶ Also presented at the 21st Symposium of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Archaeology and Art of the Christian Archaeological Society in Athens (abstract in Evangelatou [2001]).

II.1 David, biblical model of the iconophiles

David is an Old Testament figure who was very frequently used for typological exegesis in Byzantine culture. As Jesus' forefather and the one who had been anointed by God (*χριστός*), he appeared in Christological exegesis as prefiguring Christ himself.⁷⁷ As the one whom God had chosen to become the virtuous and glorious king of Israel, he was considered the biblical type *par excellence* of the Byzantine emperor, the New David of the New Israel.⁷⁸ As a man who was faced with many adversities and temptations in life but managed to overcome them through his faith in God, and as the writer of the psalms that narrate these events, he was seen as the moral example every Christian should imitate in his or her striving for salvation.⁷⁹ As it will be discussed below, David is also frequently mentioned in the literary tradition of the Byzantine Church, including iconophile texts, as a model for the pious and heroic defenders of Orthodoxy. Among his numerous depictions in the ninth-century marginal psalters, those that are most appropriate for such a typological interpretation are the illustrations of the (apocryphal) Psalm 151, which this chapter will examine.

Unfortunately, both the Pantokrator and the Paris marginal Psalter have now lost the pages which included this psalm.⁸⁰ In the Chludov Psalter the illustration takes up an entire opening (figs 22-23). On folio 147v appear the last verse of Psalm 150 and the inscription *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΠΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΑΙΟΓΡΑΦΟC Α* ("150 psalms and one written in

⁷⁷ Already in the New Testament, Goppelt (1982), 82-90. For patristic references Walter (1976), esp. 57-62; Brubaker (1999), 187. The scene of David's unction alludes twice to Christ's Incarnation in two miniatures of the Chludov Psalter. On folio 79r, where it appears below an image of the Virgin and Child (fig. 100), and on folio 89r, where it faces a depiction of Christ's Transfiguration on folio 88v (figs 230-31). The connection between David and Christ on folio 1v of the Chludov Psalter has been discussed above, p. 40.

⁷⁸ Alexander (1977), 227, notes 53-54, with rich bibliographic and textual references; Dagron (1996), 27, 68-70, 205-206. See also Brubaker (1999), 185-193, with reference to the possible comparison between David and Basil I in the miniatures of cod. Paris. gr. 510. For characteristic visual comparisons between the Byzantine emperor and David see, for example, the nine silver plates with scenes of David's life found in Cyprus and dated to the reign of Herakleios, to whom they are considered to allude, Wander (1973), Wander (1975), Alexander (1977), Trilling (1978), with previous bibliography (figs 34-35, 50). Also the ivory casket of the Palazzo Venezia, depicting an imperial couple on the lid, and scenes of David's life on the sides (figs 51, 86), Brubaker (1999), 185, with previous bibliography. See also pp. 63, 93.

⁷⁹ For example, Gregory of Nyssa, *In psalmos*, PG 44, 493B-500A (part I, chapter 3, trans. Heine [1995], 87-92).

⁸⁰ For the Pantokrator Psalter see Corrigan (1992), 145, for the Paris marginal Psalter Dufrenne (1966), 41.

his own hand” – namely Psalm 151). In the lower half of the page David is shown playing his psaltery in the midst of his flock (Psalm 151:1-2), after having killed a lion and a bear.⁸¹ The facing folio contains the entire text of Psalm 151 and is illustrated by the scene of David beheading Goliath (151:6-7).⁸² In order to appreciate the anti-iconoclastic allusions of these miniatures, we must first turn to another opening of the Chludov Psalter, where a composition with obviously iconophile content (folio 23v) faces an image of David holding his psaltery among his flock (folio 24r).

Folios 23v-24r of the Chludov Psalter

On folio 23v of the Chludov Psalter, Psalm 25:5 “I have hated the assembly of wicked doers; and will not sit with ungodly men” is illustrated with an overtly polemical anti-iconoclastic miniature (fig. 20).⁸³ Nikephoros, the iconophile patriarch deposed in 815 by the iconoclast Emperor Leo V,⁸⁴ appears as a haloed saint, holding in his left hand a medallion with the image of Christ to which he draws our attention with his right, thereby demonstrating his faith in the holy icons. The “ungodly”, the participants of the iconoclast council of 815 presided over by Patriarch Theodotos and the emperor’s son, Symbarios-Constantine, are depicted below him, whitewashing a similar circular image of Christ.⁸⁵ Next to this icon a stream of blood inscribed *AIMA* (blood) emerges from a crack in the wall, flows down to the floor and under the feet of the participants, and gushes up again at shoulder level between the figures of the patriarch and the emperor’s son.⁸⁶ Psalm 25:9-10 reads: “Destroy not my soul together with the ungodly, nor my life with bloody men; in whose hands are iniquities, and their right hand is filled with bribes.”⁸⁷ The motif of the bleeding icon may have been suggested by specific words of the psalm, and especially the reference

⁸¹ “I was small among my brethren, and youngest in my father’s house; I tended my father’s sheep. My hands formed a musical instrument, and my fingers tuned a psaltery”.

⁸² “I went forth to meet the Philistine; and he cursed me by his idols. But I drew his own sword, and beheaded him, and removed reproach from the children of Israel”.

⁸³ Psalm 25:5 was quoted in the Seventh Ecumenical Council to declare the opposition of the participants to heretic ideas, *Mansi* XIII, 292B, trans. Sahas (1986), 115; Corrigan (1992), 115.

⁸⁴ Martin (1978), 169.

⁸⁵ A marking sign similar to the one painted above the word “ungodly” of psalm 25:5 reappears above Symbarios’ head.

⁸⁶ Corrigan (1992), 32-33, 114-115, 120.

⁸⁷ Once more, a reference mark similar to the one painted next to the word “ungodly” of verse 9 reappears between Symbarios and the iconoclast prelates on his right.

to “bloody men”, since the stream of blood emerges right next to these words. Moreover, it reflects popular stories quoted in iconophile texts which told of icons that, when damaged by Jews or other infidels, bled like living bodies.⁸⁸ Folio 23v presents the iconoclasts as the equivalent of those notoriously impious people.⁸⁹ At the same time icons are presented as miraculous holy objects that have a special relationship with their prototype, standing in for its spiritual and at times even its physical presence. Furthermore, since the blood of Christ signifies his Incarnation and his sacrifice for the salvation of humanity, the miniature also implies that icons are redemptive representations of the Word made flesh.⁹⁰

The theme of the bleeding icon links this illustration with the already familiar scene of Christ’s Crucifixion juxtaposed to the destruction of his image (fig. 1).⁹¹ In both cases the icons appear to be suffering a second Passion at the hands of the new Jews and deniers of the Lord’s Incarnation, the iconoclasts. The connection between the two compositions is supported by the shape of the vessel containing the whitewash with which the iconoclasts are obliterating Christ’s icon both on folio 23v and folio 67r: it is identical to the vessel containing the mixture of gall and vinegar in the Crucifixion scene of folio 67r, and underlines the concept of icon-destruction as a second Passion. Moreover, reference in Psalm 25:10 to the hands of the evil-doers being “filled with bribes” relates the folio 23v image of the heretics to others in the psalter where the iconoclasts are actually represented as guilty of simony (figs 2-4).⁹²

⁸⁸ Cormack (1985), 127-8; Corrigan (1992), 32-3. In December 1999, at King’s College, London, Dr Glenn Peers gave a talk on folio 23v of the Chludov Psalter under the title “Framing with blood”, investigating in detail many of the issues raised by this miniature. I am most grateful to him for sending me a copy of that paper.

⁸⁹ Corrigan (1992), 27-33, 43 ff.

⁹⁰ To justify a preference for the figurative representation of Christ as opposed to the symbolic one in the form of a lamb, the 82nd canon of the Quinisext Council of 692 declares: “For in this way (through his figure) we apprehend the depth of the humiliation of the Word of God, and are led to the remembrance of his life in the flesh, his passion and his saving death, and of the redemption which thereby came to the world.” (ed. and trans. Nedungatt – Featherstone [1995], 162-164; *Mansi* XI, 977E-980B; trans. also by Cormack [1985], 99, 101; Mango [1986], 139-140). This canon was frequently cited in the iconophile texts, for example by John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 199 (III,137); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1079A-C, 1123E-1126A, *Mansi* XIII, 40E-41B, 220CD; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus* I, PG 100, 212B, *Antirrheticus* III, PG 100, 421A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 25 (§13:14-30), 39 (§17:8-24), *Twelve chapters*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), I, 456:30-457:14 (chapter 5); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus* II, PG 99, 377D-380A, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 469B, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 346-3467 (epistle 221:122-138), 802 (532:202-221); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 188-9; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 726:22-727:15.

⁹¹ See pp. 30-31 above.

⁹² On folio 67v (fig. 2), an iconoclast priest is represented selling Church offices to other heretics, under the inspiration of a money-loving demon (see also above, pp. 31-32). The same wicked spirit keeps under his spell the iconoclast John the Grammarian, who is shown holding a bag of coins and

The very characteristic and caricatured figure with bushy hair that appears in the miniature under examination, as well as on folio 67r whitewashing the icon of Christ, can be identified with John the Grammarian, following the inscriptions accompanying the same figure on folios 51v and 35v (figs 3-4).⁹³ John was a leading figure of the iconoclast faction from 814 onwards, theological advisor of the iconoclast Emperors Leo V, Michael II, and Theophilos, and patriarch from 837 to 842.⁹⁴ He is the ninth-century iconoclasts most strongly condemned in iconophile texts.⁹⁵ This is reflected in the illustration of the Chludov Psalter, where he is the only named iconoclast, depicted as the protagonist in four compositions,⁹⁶ and in the illustration of the Pantokrator Psalter, where he appears as a prominent figure in the two anti-iconoclastic miniatures of the codex.⁹⁷

At this point we need to examine the miniature of David on folio 24r (fig. 21), in order to highlight its allusive, yet significant relation to folio 23v, and disclose the resulting iconophile significance of the entire opening. On folio 24r the psalmist appears as a young shepherd, standing frontally as Nikephoros does on the opposite page; in his left hand he holds his psaltery in a manner similar to the way the patriarch holds the icon of Christ. David is looking towards the saintly Nikephoros, while at his feet various animals of his flock look up at him. The compositional analogies between the two miniatures facing each other construct an interrelation that emphasizes an elaborate iconophile message: with his psalms, alluded to by the psaltery, David has prophesied the Incarnation of Christ that is indicated on the previous page by the icon held by Nikephoros. The psalmist with his text, and the patriarch with his support of holy icons, reveal to the people of God his Son made flesh. The point is implicitly made that the holy scriptures and the icons are of equal value for the promotion of the Orthodox faith and the knowledge of God, this being a firm tenet of the iconophile party.⁹⁸ Icons – according to iconophile argumentation – are both consequence and proof of Christ's Incarnation, since the legitimacy of his representations rests on the

surrounded by other containers full of money on folio 35v (fig. 4). Patriarch Nikephoros appears to be trampling on John, in juxtaposition to St. Peter stepping on Simon Magus, the first perpetrator of simony in the Church, on folio 51v (fig. 3, see also p. 31 above).

⁹³ Corrigan (1992), 29.

⁹⁴ Gero (1975); Martin (1978), 163 ff. See also Gouillard (1966); Corrigan (1992), 121-122.

⁹⁵ Gero (1975), 25.

⁹⁶ Folios 23v, 35v, 51v, 67r (figs 20, 4, 3, 1).

⁹⁷ Folios 16r, 165r (figs 18-19). For John the Grammarian in the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters see also Corrigan (1992), 27-29.

⁹⁸ See p. 136, n. 462 below.

reality of his human nature.⁹⁹ Moreover, in their minds David and the other prophets of the Old Testament had foreseen the Incarnation of the Saviour, which came to pass in the New Testament. This ‘fact’ allowed the iconophiles to argue that, if the Logos became visible in the ‘visionary icons’ that appeared to the prophets long before his becoming man, after his Incarnation it was more than natural to depict him in holy images that could function as ‘iconic visions’ testifying to the reality of his presence on earth.¹⁰⁰ In this line of argumentation the Psalter held a prominent role, because it contained so very many prophecies concerning Christ’s Incarnation.¹⁰¹ Thus, the extensive illustration of these prophecies with Christological scenes in the ninth-century marginal psalters has a prominent iconophile significance, inherent also in the miniatures of folios 23v and 24r in the Chludov Psalter.

The correlation and iconophile allusions of these two miniatures are further enriched through the juxtaposition of David’s flock on folio 24r, which looks up to him as if paying attention to his words, and the wicked iconoclasts on folio 23v, who are opposing Nikephoros and destroying the icons. This antithesis is analogous to frequent expressions in iconophile literature where the iconoclasts are considered as worse than animals. For example, in a passage from the Seventh Ecumenical Council they are described as “more irrational than the irrational beings” because, contrary to animals that acknowledge their creator and follow his commandments, heretics are opposed to divine law.¹⁰² So, the irrational beasts in David’s flock appear below their shepherd in a decorous and orderly manner. By contrast, the participants of the iconoclastic council of 815, far from being obedient members of Patriarch Nikephoros’ flock, have revolted against their shepherd and are seen involved in indecorous, insurgent acts. The disorderly disposition of the council participants and their sinister appearance (emphasized by the blood flowing around them and the demonic looks of John the Grammarian) is far removed from the orderly, static and

⁹⁹ See p. 40, n. 59 above, and p. 120 below.

¹⁰⁰ See Brubaker (1989a), 40-42; Corrigan (1992), 62 ff; see also p. 40, notes 60-61 above.

¹⁰¹ The great number of prophetic references to Christ in the Psalter are evident by the relevant New Testament quotations and the comments on the psalms, collected by Walter (1986) in relation to Christological miniatures in the Byzantine marginal psalters. Many more psalm verses were Christologically interpreted in psalm commentaries; cf. Tables 6, 8, 10, 12.

¹⁰² *Mansi* XIII, 212CD. For other similar expressions see, for example, Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrhethici I-II*, PG 100, 276B, 477A, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 721BC, 740AC, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 58 (§26:17-18); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 244 (epistle 126:6-7), 558 (402:6-10); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 780:17-18. For the much more frequent cases where the iconoclasts are described not worse, but equal to the wildest animals, see below, p. 59, notes 131-32.

symmetric representation of an Orthodox synod in its standard Byzantine iconography (cf. fig. 45).¹⁰³

All of these visual elements contribute to the antithesis between David's peaceful herd and the "bloodthirsty" beasts of iconoclasm that have driven Nikephoros from the congregation of the faithful, causing the Orthodox flock to lose its pastor. In fact, this image corresponds exactly to a passage from the *Vita Nicephori*, where the patriarch refused to participate in the iconoclast council of 815 (as he also appears to be doing in the Chludov miniature), because his flock had been taken away from him and he was left alone to fight the "wild beasts" of heresy, and the "wolves pretending to be sheep", which were persecuting the pastor of the Church.¹⁰⁴ As a result of this refusal, Nikephoros was deposed and exiled.¹⁰⁵

David, who on folio 24r of the Chludov Psalter is shown as looking at the patriarch across the page, seems to be encouraging Nikephoros to bear these misfortunes according to the message of Psalm 26:1-4, written next to the figure of the psalmist: "...The Lord is the defender of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? When evil-doers drew night against me to eat up my flesh, my persecutors and mine enemies, they fainted and fell. Though an army should set itself in array against me, my heart shall not be afraid... One thing have I asked of the Lord, this will I earnestly seek: that I should dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, that I should behold the fair beauty of the Lord and survey his temple". There are several parallels here with Nikephoros' case. The patriarch was kept prisoner in his house by a military guard and was finally expelled from Constantinople during the night, on the ground that he wished to preserve in "the temple of the Lord" the icons that depict his "fair beauty".¹⁰⁶

On folios 23v-24r of the Chludov Psalter, both Nikephoros and David – the patriarch through the imagery and the psalmist through the text – appear fearless and persistent against their enemies thanks to their faith in God. A similar parallel between them is drawn in the *Vita Nicephori*, where the patriarch is said to have protected his flock of Orthodox Christians from the iconoclast transgressors,

¹⁰³ Maguire (1997), 185. For the representation of councils in Byzantine art see Walter (1970).

¹⁰⁴ PG 100, 117CD; see also 121D, 124A.

¹⁰⁵ By the beginning of Lent 815 Nikephoros was held prisoner in his house for opposing the iconoclast aspirations of Leo V. After his refusal to participate to an iconoclast council he was deposed, in the last week of Lent. The council was held soon after the appointment of the new Patriarch Theodotos on Easter Day, probably in Easter week. See Martin (1978), 168-171.

¹⁰⁶ Martin (1978), 168-169.

following the example of David who, as a shepherd, protected his herd from the attacking lions and bears.¹⁰⁷ This passage can be even more appropriately related to the miniature of David that illustrates psalm 151 on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter, examined in the following pages.

Folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter

The iconophile allusions in David's depiction as shepherd and psalmist on folio 24r are paralleled on folio 147v (fig. 22), where David is once more depicted as shepherd and psalmist. At the bottom of the page he is seen killing the lion and the bear that threatened his flock, and above these actions he is watching over his animals while playing his psaltery, inspired by the Holy Ghost shown in the shape of a dove standing on his instrument. The iconographic peculiarities that characterise this miniature deserve special attention to clarify the underlying iconophile connotations. The presence of the Holy Spirit on the psalmist's instrument is unique in Byzantine art. It does not appear even in the parallel miniatures of the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters (folio 188v, fig. 24, and folio 248r respectively).¹⁰⁸ Moreover, it was not normal iconographic practice to combine the killing of both the lion and the bear with a picture of David sounding his psaltery while surrounded by his flock. Since this is the key to unlock the iconophile significance of the composition, let us compare it with related material from other Byzantine psalters to appreciate its singularity.

First of all, it should be noted that while Psalm 151 mentions the time when David was a shepherd (verse 1), it makes no reference to the episode with the wild animals shown in our miniature. Such reference is made in *I.Kings* 17:34-35, but not in the psalms. This is probably the reason why the killing of the beasts is rarely combined in Byzantine psalters with the figure of David tending his flock and/or playing his psaltery. Another combination of the three episodes in one composition appears again in the eleventh-century indirect copies of our codex, the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters (fig. 24).¹⁰⁹ In the three fourteenth-century Slavonic psalters

¹⁰⁷ PG 100, 149D-152A.

¹⁰⁸ Der Nersessian (1970), 58, fig. 295; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 144. See p. 26, n. 7 above for the relation of the three psalters.

¹⁰⁹ Folios 188v, 248r respectively (see the previous note).

that are influenced by the tradition of Byzantine marginal psalter illustration, the scenes again appear on the same page, but compositionally divided rather than linked together, through the use of different settings, as it will be discussed below in more detail (p. 57, figs 25-27).

Among the other six surviving Byzantine marginal psalters, there are no others instances where these scenes are shown together.¹¹⁰ Aside from the total of nine Byzantine marginal psalters, 76 other Byzantine illustrated psalters are known to us today.¹¹¹ Of these, I have been able to examine a total of 72,¹¹² and reached the following conclusions – presented in detail in Table 1, p. 466. In 18 of the 72 psalters David is depicted 19 times in a natural setting, as a young shepherd sounding a musical instrument representing his psaltery.¹¹³ In only five of the 18 psalters David confronts the lion and/or the bear (in a total of six scenes), but never in the same composition as where he is sounding his psaltery. Although the two scenes appear three times on the same page, they are separated by a frame;¹¹⁴ in three other instances they appear on facing or following page.¹¹⁵ In these six cases it is only once that David confronts both the lion and the bear – in the well-known cod. Paris. gr. 139 (Table 1, number 1, fig. 33). Four times he fights with only the lion,¹¹⁶ and once with only the bear.¹¹⁷ Aside from the 18 illustrated Byzantine psalters mentioned above two more have survived, which show only David confronting the beasts (once the

¹¹⁰ Dufrenne (1978). The Pantokrator Psalter, the Paris marginal Psalter, and the marginal psalter in Baltimore (Walters Art Gallery, W 733) lack the respective folios (Corrigan [1992], 145; Dufrenne [1966], 41; Miner [1955], 233). The Bristol Psalter and the marginal psalter in Sinai (cod. gr. 48) do not depict neither of the three episodes (Dufrenne [1966], 65; Weitzmann [1980], 1); the Hamilton Psalter shows David as shepherd on folio 40r and 41v, in David's biographical cycle before the psalms (and not in relation to Psalm 151), but does not include the scene of the killing of the wild animals (Havice [1978], 369, figs in Džurova [1990], I, 177-78). The Utrecht and the Stuttgart Psalters depict David only as shepherd and player of a musical instrument (De Wald [1930], 72; De Wald [1930a], 111).

¹¹¹ According to the provisional list of illustrated Byzantine psalters by Lowden (1988), 259.

¹¹² From all the psalters in the list by Lowden (1988), 259, I have not been able to obtain clear information on the illustration of number 38 (St Petersburg, Public Library, cod. gr. 214), number 74 (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, cod. 240), number 79 (Mount Sinai, Monastery of St Catherine monastery, cod. gr. 2123) and number 85 (Basel, University Library, cod. B.X.33).

¹¹³ Table 1, numbers 1, 3-13, 15-21. Cod. Vat. gr. 752 (Table 1, numbers 4-5) contains two cycles of miniatures on David's life, both including scenes of his early life as a shepherd. Thus, in the 18 of the 72 psalters considered here, David is playing his instrument in a natural setting a total of 19 times. In six of these cases David's flock is omitted (Table 1, numbers 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20), but his youthful appearance and the pastoral setting still suggest him being a shepherd.

¹¹⁴ Table 1, numbers 5, 18, 20; (figs 28-29).

¹¹⁵ Table 1, numbers 1 (figs 33, 41), 4, 6 (figs 30-31). The cases examined here are six, rather than five, because cod. Vat. gr. 752 comprises two such sets of images.

¹¹⁶ Table 1, numbers 4-6, 20; (figs 28, 31).

¹¹⁷ Table 1, number 18 (fig. 29).

lion, once both the lion and the bear), but have no miniature of David as shepherd sounding his psaltery.¹¹⁸

The evidence provided by these 20 psalters suggests that outside the tradition of marginal psalter illustration the two scenes of David the shepherd sounding his psaltery and David the shepherd killing the wild beasts are never combined in one composition. Moreover, the former scene appears more than twice as often as the latter (19 cases, compared to eight). In the eight cases depicting David with the wild beasts, in only two does he fight both the lion and the bear (figs 32-33);¹¹⁹ usually he struggles only with the lion (five times, figs 28, 31) and in a single instance with the bear (fig 29).¹²⁰ Finally, it should be noted that only in three of all the 20 psalters containing the miniatures mentioned above, the illustration relates to psalm 151;¹²¹ everywhere else it appears at the beginning of the psalter, either as a headpiece to Psalm 1, or preceding the *incipit*. Since I have not been able to obtain a clear picture regarding the miniatures of four other surviving illustrated Byzantine psalters, the above numbers are not conclusive; nevertheless, these findings are strongly indicative of the prevailing tendencies in the choice and handling of the subject matter.¹²²

We are led to conclude, therefore, that the depiction of David sounding his psaltery while watching over his peaceful flock after having killed the lion and the bear – in other words the combination of the three scenes in one composition – is exceptional in the illustration of Byzantine psalters. Among the 81 psalters I have examined in total (the nine marginal ones and the other 72 mentioned above) it survives only in the Chludov Psalter and in its eleventh century indirect copies, the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters.¹²³ The fact that it is not found in the illustration

¹¹⁸ Table 1, numbers 2 (fig. 32), 14.

¹¹⁹ Table 1, numbers 1, 2.

¹²⁰ Table 1, numbers 4-6, 14, 18, 20.

¹²¹ Table 1, numbers 3, 5, 11.

¹²² See note 112 above. Concerning cod. gr. 214 of the Public Library in St Petersburg and cod. gr. 2123 of the St Catherine's monastery on Mount Sinai, I have not been able to obtain any description of their illustration from published catalogues. Bancalari (1894), 170-171, mentions that in cod. 240 of the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome David is depicted on folio 3v, but no description of the image is given – David may be depicted as shepherd-musician, or as king-psalmist, iconographic types that are common for the illustration of the *incipit* of the psalter. Omont (1886), 5-6, does not mention any "peintures" for cod. B.X.33 of the University Library in Basel, so it is probable that the manuscript contains only decorative and no figurative miniatures.

¹²³ From the list of eighty-five Byzantine illustrated psalters by Lowden (1988), 259, I have examined in person or through detailed descriptions in bibliography all but four, mentioned in notes 112, 122 above. The laconic references I found on two of these manuscripts (cod. 240 of the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome and cod. B.X.33 of the University Library in Basel – see previous note) allow us to suppose that these psalters do not contain an elaborate composition similar to that on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter.

to Psalm 151 in either the Utrecht, the Stuttgart, or the Bristol Psalter, indicates that it was probably not included in the tradition of Byzantine psalter illustration before the ninth century. It seems to have been freshly introduced in the post-iconoclast Byzantine marginal psalters (such as the Chludov Psalter, and probably other contemporary or shortly earlier psalters now lost). The appearance of these scenes in close relation to each other in the three fourteenth-century Slavonic psalters that are influenced by the Byzantine tradition of marginal-psalter illustration (figs 25-27), further suggests that combining these episodes in one composition was specific to this tradition.

However, despite the similarity between the three Slavonic codices with the Chludov Psalter, the Chludov remains unique in the tight correlation of the three scenes. The killing of the two wild beasts in the bottom corners of folio 147v is presented as safeguarding the peace and well-being of the flock David is tending in the dominating central scene of the page. The antithetical tension that characterises the composition as a whole is lost in the relevant miniatures of the three Slavonic psalters. On folio 205r in the Kiev Psalter, the psalmist tending his flock is starkly separated from David killing the lion, by the field on which the herd is grazing (fig. 25).¹²⁴ The two scenes do not share the same space as they do in the Chludov Psalter, the shepherd and his flock being rendered in a natural setting, while the lion-killing takes place on the blank background of the page. Moreover, it is only the lion that appears, the bear being omitted. On folio 247v in the Tomič Psalter, the animals of David's flock, David sounding his psaltery, and David killing the lion and the bear, are three separate themes on the page, each standing on its own piece of ground (fig. 26).¹²⁵ On folio 186r in the Munich Psalter the antithesis between safety and danger is created by depicting four scenes on the same ground (fig. 27).¹²⁶ At the top left of the folio, the psalmist tending his flock is separated from the other episodes by a stream, on the far side of which David appears three times engaged in combat. He confronts Goliath with the sling (top right), he beheads the Philistine (bottom left), and he kills the lion and the bear (bottom right). In this case the tension between the protected flock and its attacking predators is dissolved into a wider context, where peace and safety are juxtaposed to combat and triumph over evil enemies in more general terms.

¹²⁴ St Petersburg, Public Library, cod. 1251 F VI, published in facsimile by Vzdornov (1978).

¹²⁵ Moscow, State Historical Museum, cod. 2752, published in facsimile by Džurova (1990).

¹²⁶ Munich, Bayerisches Staatsbibliothek, cod. slav. 4, published in facsimile by Dufrenne *et alii* (1978).

The idea of combining the killing of the beasts with the defeat of Goliath, rather than with the scene of David tending his flock, seems inspired by *I.Kings* 17:34-37, where indeed the two combats are compared, rather than from Psalm 151 which, as already mentioned, does not refer to the two wild animals.

As we have seen from the above, the miniature on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter is exceptional for three reasons: it illustrates the killing of both the lion and the bear, it tightly combines them in one composition with David sounding his psaltery while watching over his peaceful flock, and it shows the dove of the Holy Ghost on the psalmist's instrument, to point to the divine inspiration of his mission. In this way the miniature places particular emphasis on the conflict between the forces of good and evil. It highlights the contrast between the defeat of irrationality and disorder, and the triumph of peace and harmony. Perhaps these rarely united elements were shown together as an allusion to the confrontation of iconoclast ataxia and Orthodox order, (the later always a result of guidance by the Holy Ghost, which is shown inspiring David's psalmodizing).¹²⁷

Such an interpretation is supported by the symbolic significance of pastoral and hunting themes in Byzantine culture, and especially in Byzantine literature (including iconophile texts). This tradition was largely shaped under the influence of relevant New Testament references. The theme of the Good Shepherd putting his life at risk to save his flock from the wolves is mentioned in *John* 10:11-16 and 27-28 as a simile of Christ protecting his followers. Moreover, *Matthew* 18:12-13 and *Luke* 15:4-5 make reference to Christ the shepherd searching for and finding the sinful lost sheep and returning it to the flock of Christians. In *Acts* 20:28-29 Paul says to the elders of the Church "Guard yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers. Be shepherds of the church of God... I know that after I leave, savage wolves will come in among you and will not spare the flock." Similar is the spirit of Christ's words to his apostles in *Luke* 10:3 "Go! I am sending you out like lambs among wolves", and to all his audience in *Matthew* 7:15 "Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves."

Scriptural passages of this kind inspired one of the most frequently used rhetorical motives in the literary tradition of the Byzantine Church: the comparison of

¹²⁷ For the symbolism of the Holy Spirit see pp. 65-69, below.

the Christian congregation to a flock, of its spiritual leaders to shepherds, and of its heretic persecutors or other enemies to wild animals threatening the flock.¹²⁸ The specific reference of most of these biblical passages to wolves, and of other scriptural excerpts like that of *I. Peter* 5:8 to the devil being a lion in search of prey, led to the frequent comparison of demons, impious men and heretics specifically with wolves and lions.¹²⁹ These *topoi* are used in various texts, ranging from psalm commentaries to homilies and dogmatic discourses. The same ideas are found in iconophile literature, where the iconoclasts are not only described “worse than animals”,¹³⁰ but more frequently compared to ravaging wild beasts (*θηρία*), usually wolves and lions that have attacked the herd of the faithful and have caused death and distress with their heretic teaching and their persecutions.¹³¹ It was especially Leo III, who was the first to impose his iconoclastic views on the Church in 730, and Leo V who reinstated the prohibition against icon worship in 815, who were compared to lions, both because of their name as well as their fierce and ungodly manners.¹³²

¹²⁸ See Lampe (1961), 1110, “ποιμαίνω”, “ποιμαντικός”, “ποιμήν”, “ποίμνη”, “ποίμνιον”. For some characteristic examples see: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1249C, 1260B, *Mansi* V, 352C; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VII, 77B; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 505CD, 532BC, 716D, 933CD; Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 732A (Psalm 5:8), 1157D (Psalm 67:31); Leontios presbyter, *Homilies*, ed. Datema – Allen (1987), 88:75-7 (homily II), 174:254-259 (homily III), trans. Allen (1991), 42 (§6), 57-58 (§19); Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 86 (VI:101).

¹²⁹ For example, see: Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), I, 227 (§183, Psalm 21:13-14), 231 (§191, Psalm 21:22), II, 111 (§777, Psalm 73:18-21); Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 784C (Psalm 9:30), 817CD (Psalm 16:12); Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1017C (Psalm 21:22), 1116AB (Psalm 34:17); Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* III, 532B, 581E; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1020C, 1029D-1032A, 1037B, 1093B, 1096C, 1098D; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VII, 805BC; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 717B, 721A, 733C. All the above psalm-commentary passages mention “lions” and most of the council passages “wolves”. For the comparison of the devil or demons to lions see also Provatakis (1980), 236, n. 349. For the figurative use of wild animals (as referring to enemies) in Byzantine literature, in particular in the writings of the historians Niketas Choniates (around 1150-1215) and Nikephoros Gregoras (around 1290-1361) see Kazhdan – Franklin (1984), 267.

¹³⁰ See p. 52, n. 102.

¹³¹ For example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 293A, 325C, 455A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 177CD, 196A, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 289AB *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 505AB, 525B, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 573B, 612A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 124 (§75:28-30); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 349B, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 313 (epistle 189:11), 367 (232:37-41), 449 (306:11-13), 491 (357:6), 496 (362:10-11), 742 (501:40-44); *Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, and Pseudo-Damascenos, *Letter to Theophilus*, ed. Munitiz *et alii* (1997), 103:8-10, 111:10-11, 165:12-13, 187:29-30, 189:12-13; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 742:9, 762:8/12; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 157:6 (§55), 169:11/14-15 (§68); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 112B, 117CD, 121D, 124A, 125C, 132BC, 133C, 136A, 141B; *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 180D, 281A; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 881C, 885C.

¹³² Usually the emperors, or other iconoclasts, are said to have the name or the attitude of a beast or lion, or to roar like a lion when they speak out their heretic beliefs or they give orders of persecution against iconophiles (“*θηριώννυμος*”, “*θηριογνώμων*”, “*λεοντώννυμος*” “*θυμολέων*”, “*βρύζας ὡς λέων*”, etc. See also Auzépy [1999], 72). Alternatively, adjectives like “untamed”, “blood-thirsty”, “killing”,

The long literary tradition outlined above is also reflected in the visual field. For example, representations of a shepherd guarding his flock against wild animals found in the Roman catacombs of the third and fourth century have been interpreted as symbols of the Church threatened by persecutors or heretics.¹³³ Such are, for example, the cases of a shepherd standing between his flock and two wild animals, a boar and an ass, in a wall painting in the catacomb of Praetextatus (fig. 36),¹³⁴ and of a shepherd and his flock flanked by two wolves in a wall painting in the catacomb of Domitilla (fig. 37).¹³⁵ In a fourth-century wall painting in the catacomb of Praetextatus, the two elders conspiring against Susanna are depicted as two wolves approaching a sheep. The composition has been interpreted by scholars as a typological reference to the Church of Rome threatened by Arian heretics during the pontificate of Liberius (352-366). This reading is based on contemporary Christian literature, where both Susanna threatened by the elders and sheep attacked by wolves are used as allusions to the Church persecuted by heretics or other enemies.¹³⁶

Most significant for the interpretation of the miniature on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter are the scenes illustrating Psalms 25:4-5 and 26:1 on folios 27v-28r of the eleventh-century Theodore Psalter (fig. 38). The content of these miniatures is very close to that of the illustration of the same psalms on folios 23v-24r of the Chludov Psalter as described above, but with some important innovations. On folio 27v of the Theodore Psalter Patriarch Nikephoros and Theodore the Studite hold together a medallion with the image of Christ, and on the bottom of the page both these iconophiles are debating with the iconoclast Emperor Leo V. The iconoclast council of 815 is not depicted, but a group of heretics whitewashing Christ's icon are

"beastly", etc. are attached to the lion-name of the emperors ("ἀνήμερος", "αἰμοβόρος", "φόνιος", "θηριώδης" ... "Λέων"). For examples, see: Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 532A; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 590 (epistle 421:7), 633 (448:12); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 155:41-2, 157:92, 158:106; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 741:17, 750:16-17, 780:4/9-10, 783:7-9, 787:6, 798:9; *Vita Germani*, ed. Lamza (1975), 222:295-296, 226:357-358/366; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 100:6 (§10), 119:9 (§23), 124:21 (§27), 130:9 (§31), 168:26 (§68); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 100:6; *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 112B, 116A, 132BC; *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 169D, 265A, 277C, 280A, 288C, 300B, 304B; *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 74 (§12:1), 77 (§15:1), 85 (§19:6), 85 (§20:14), 86 (§21:16), 86 (§22:1/8-9); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Gouillard (1987), 31:129, 33:148; *Life of Michael Synkellos*, ed. Cunningham (1991), 62:1, 68:2, 78:24, 108:8/14; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 877D, 881B; *Vita Iosephi hymnographi*, PG 105, 953D.

¹³³ Thérel (1973), 40, n. 1 for further bibliography on the theme of the Good Shepherd in art, 40-44 for the shepherd protecting his flock.

¹³⁴ Dagens (1966), 350.

¹³⁵ Thérel (1973), 43, fig. 14.

¹³⁶ Dagens (1966), especially 347 ff.

very similar to the analogous group on folio 23v of the Chludov Psalter.¹³⁷ On folio 28r of the Theodore Psalter David is not looking in the direction of the two iconophile figures on the facing page, so that the meaningful interrelation in the miniatures on folios 23v-24r (figs 20-21) of the Chludov Psalter between the psalmist and Nikephoros is not immediately obvious. Moreover, while most of the animals in David's herd look up at their shepherd as if attending to his words, the scene is not peaceful throughout, since in the lower left corner of the page a wolf is carrying off a ram – shown on the same level as the iconoclasts whitewashing Christ's icon on the facing page.¹³⁸ In consequence, there is no reference here, as there is in the Chludov Psalter, to iconoclasts being worse than animals which, in contrast to heretics, obey their shepherd and God's will. There does, however, seem to be a reference to iconoclasts as wild beasts that attack the flock of Orthodox Christians with their heretic teachings, and lead to perdition those sheep that do not remain close to their iconophile pastors who, in iconophile polemics, were indeed compared to David.¹³⁹ Such an interpretation is supported by the movement and position of the wolf on the page: it is as if it is about to leap from folio 28r to folio 27v, towards the heretics whitewashing Christ's icon, carrying with it the captured sheep like an iconoclast wolf stealing the flock of the Orthodox Church.

A logical consequence of the literary and visual tradition mentioned above is that the defeat of the devil, temptations, impious or heretic men and evil generally can be compared to chasing away or hunting down wild animals threatening a flock, sometimes with specific reference to David. For example, in his *Selecta in Jeremiam* Origen compares the confrontation of the psalmist-shepherd with the lion to the confrontation of the spiritual David, Christ, with the devil.¹⁴⁰ The ninth-century iconophile writer Michael the Synkellos, in his *Vita Dionysii Areopagitae* describes

¹³⁷ Der Nersessian (1970), 24.

¹³⁸ Der Nersessian (1970), 24, describes the predator as a fox, probably judging by the pointed ears and bushy tail of the animal. However, it is evident that a fox cannot carry away a ram in its mouth, as the beast on folio 28r of the Theodore Psalter. Moreover, the grey colour of its fur and his robust and large body suggest that this animal is indeed a wolf, a species with which pointed ears and bushy tail are also compatible. In the description of the miniature in *Theodore Psalter* (2000) the animal is called a wolf. In Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 72, the predator that appears on folio 44v of the Barberini Psalter, illustrating again Psalm 26 in a composition similar to that of the Theodore Psalter, is also described as a wolf. The illustration of Psalm 25 in the Barberini Psalter is similar to that of the Chludov Psalter, but since it appears on folio 43v, it is not juxtaposed to the illustration of Psalm 26 on folio 44v.

¹³⁹ Like Patriarch Nikephoros compared to David as shepherd, see pp. 53-54 above, and other iconophiles compared to David confronting Goliath, see p. 73 below.

¹⁴⁰ PG 13, 596C.

how the saint protects the members of his Christian flock from their spiritual aggressors (heathens, Jews, heretics) like a shepherd who chases away the wild beasts with spear, sling, pastoral rod and torch, and saves his animals from the teeth and claws of predators.¹⁴¹ In the *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, leading iconophile of the second Iconoclasm, the murder of the iconoclast Leo V is considered as a just punishment, carried out by Christ who has “crushed the lion-head” according to the wording of psalm 57:7 “God has broken the cheek-teeth of the lions”.¹⁴² The text that is the most revealing of all for the interpretation of the miniature on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter in terms of the defeat of iconoclasm is a passage from the *Vita Nicephori* mentioned earlier, where the patriarch is reported to have succeeded, by following David’s example, to kill with his Orthodox teaching the lion and the bear whose heretic voices were raised against the flock of Christ.¹⁴³

It should be remembered that comparing the confrontation of good and evil to the hunting of wild animals has its roots going in the literary and visual tradition of antiquity, where the battle of a hunter or prince with wild beasts was often taken symbolically as the struggle and victory over passions or evil forces, or as an allegory of human life.¹⁴⁴ The juxtaposition of pastoral and hunting scenes in the sixth-century mosaic floors of churches in Palestine, and in the seventh-century (?) mosaic floor of the Great Palace in Constantinople, has similarly been interpreted as a reference to the combat between good and evil in the Church and in the Byzantine empire respectively.¹⁴⁵ Furthermore, hunting and killing of wild animals in Byzantine imperial imagery was allegorical for the defeat of enemies, both in the depiction of such scenes in works of art, and in the actual organisation of imperial hunts.¹⁴⁶ Similar ideas were employed in imperial panegyric.¹⁴⁷

It is perhaps in this light that we should interpret the representation of David, the biblical type *par excellence* of the Byzantine emperor, killing both the lion and the bear in two psalters that were commissioned for Byzantine rulers: cod. Paris. gr. 139 (fig. 33), possibly for Romanos II as a present from his father Constantine VII

¹⁴¹ PG 4, 644C, 645AB.

¹⁴² Ed. Papadakis (1970), 87 (§22:18-19).

¹⁴³ *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 149D-152A.

¹⁴⁴ Merrony (1998), 475, with further bibliography.

¹⁴⁵ Merrony (1998), especially 452-456, 465-466, 474-482; Trilling (1989), especially 57-66.

¹⁴⁶ Maguire (1994), 193-197.

¹⁴⁷ Maguire (1988), 93, n. 33; Maguire (1994), 192-93.

Porphyrogegnetos;¹⁴⁸ and cod. Marc. gr. Z17 (fig. 32), the Psalter of Basil II.¹⁴⁹ As noted above, the appearance of both episodes in the same codex was extremely rare in Byzantine psalters: it survives only in these two manuscripts, in the Chludov Psalter, and its two eleventh-century indirect copies – the Theodore and Barberini Psalters. The emphasis placed on these two episodes in the two codices that were once owned by Byzantine emperors may have been intended to allude to the valour of the ruler who, as a New David, effectively protects his subjects from all enemies threatening the empire's safety and well-being.¹⁵⁰ A similar significance may be attributed to the killing of the lion and the bear in two of the nine silver plates found in Cyprus, depicting scenes from David's life that have been interpreted as alluding to emperor Herakleios (figs 34-35).¹⁵¹

The widespread literary and visual use of the killing of beasts as a metaphor for the defeat of evil powers in Byzantine culture, and the frequent comparison of heretics with wild animals threatening the sheep of Christ, point to the conclusion that the miniature on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter would be viewed by ninth-century iconophile viewers as symbolic of the defeat of their iconoclast enemies and the reinstatement of peace in the flock of the Orthodox Church.

The appearance of the dove signifying the Holy Ghost on David's psalteries deserves further comment. Since the only other animals depicted are those of David's flock (aside from the lion and the bear), the bird perched on his psalteries can not be considered a random choice (as it might be, for example, in a picture of Orpheus playing the lyre and surrounded by various animals, an image that in Early Christian art symbolises Christ attracting and saving with his teaching the souls of believers).¹⁵²

¹⁴⁸ Buchthal (1974); Cutler (1984), 63-71, with previous bibliography; *The Glory of Byzantium* (1997), 240-242, cat. no. 163.

¹⁴⁹ Cutler (1992a); Cutler (1984), 115-19, with previous bibliography.

¹⁵⁰ Maguire (1988), 93, sees the killing of the wild beasts on folio IVv in the Psalter of Basil II as a metaphor for the triumph of the emperor over his enemies, and he considers all six scenes on the folio as a visual panegyric referred to Basil II as a New David (also Maguire [1997], 188). Cutler (1992a), 8-9, connects the first five of the six miniatures with specific events in the life of Basil II, but then rejects the hypothesis that the whole page is a political allegory, because this would require subverting the order of the miniatures in order to make them correspond to the order of the relevant events in the emperor's life. There is, however, the alternative to see the miniatures as alluding in a more general sense to the virtues of the emperor as a second David (cf. Maguire [1988], 93), rather than to invest every single miniature with strictly topical allusions.

¹⁵¹ See note 78 above for the connection between the David plates and Herakleios. Alexander (1977), 231, n. 66, for the Byzantine emperor as the shepherd of his people.

¹⁵² On the theme of Christ-Orpheus see Stern (1974), where the existence of David-Orpheus in the Jewish tradition is also proposed. For a critique of the latter idea see Murray (1977). See also Maguire (1989), 219, for the Byzantine emperor as Orpheus.

There is evidence in other miniatures of the Chludov Psalter which suggests that this bird represents the Holy Ghost. It appears again in scenes of Christ's Baptism (folios 72v, 75v, 117r, figs 66, 197, 198); likewise in the miniature on folio 50v illustrating Psalm 50:13-14 "Cast me not away from thy presence; and remove not thy holy spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of thy salvation; and establish me with thy directing spirit", where David is shown raising his hands in supplication towards a descending dove, which again signifies the Holy Ghost (fig. 39). A dove with the same significance appears also above the Virgin in the Annunciation of folio 45r (fig. 40), and above a medallion with the Virgin and Child blessed by the hand of God on folio 44r (fig. 102). The dove perched on the psaltery on folio 147v is turned towards David's head, as if about to whisper in his ears the divinely inspired verses of his psalms. Usually David sounding his psaltery is accompanied in the Byzantine psalters by a female figure (figs 28, 30, 41), sometimes inscribed *Μελωδία* (Melodia) and on one occasion *Σύνεσις* (Synesis).¹⁵³ These figures have been interpreted as personifications of the spirit that guides the psalmist in his divinely appointed work.¹⁵⁴ It seems that on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter the female figure has been replaced by the dove which, as symbol of the Holy Ghost, makes a more direct and emphatic theological reference to the divine inspiration of the psalmist.

Showing the dove of the Holy Ghost in the Chludov Psalter has itself important iconophile connotations. According to an iconophile argument presented in the Seventh Ecumenical Council by patriarch Tarasios, certain men that in the past had rejected and destroyed images of Christ, of the angels, and of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove, were condemned as heretics by ecclesiastical authorities.¹⁵⁵ Following this observation, a letter of the clergy and the monks of Antioch to the participants of a council held in Constantinople in 535-536, when the heretic bishop of Antioch Severos was condemned, was read again in the Ecumenical Council of 787. According to that letter, Severos was a sorcerer and servant of the demons. He

¹⁵³ The female figure that accompanies David sounding his psaltery is inscribed as Melodia in cod. Paris. gr. 139 and cod. Petropolitanus gr. 269 (Table 1, numbers 1, 19), while she is named Synesis in cod. Marc. gr. 565 (Table 1, number 10); see also Cutler (1978), 47, n.54. In cod. Vat. gr. 752 the whole miniature of David next to the female figure, illustrating psalm 151, is inscribed "David's Melodia" (*ἡ μελωδία τοῦ Δα(ν)ιδ*), De Wald (1942), 40; (Table 1, number 5). In all the other cases listed in Cutler (1984), 21, 27, 48, 51, 60, 81, 83, the female figure is not identified by an inscription, but Cutler names her Melodia since she resembles closely the inscribed figures mentioned above; See also Table 1, numbers 3, 5-9, 12, 15, 21.

¹⁵⁴ Cutler (1978), 47-48.

¹⁵⁵ *Mansi* XIII, 180E-181B.

had destroyed the sanctuaries and the holy vessels of the churches and had confiscated the golden or silver doves that hung “as types of the Holy Spirit” above the baptismal fonts and the holy altars (obviously with the intention to melt them down). At this point Tarasios presiding over the Council of 787 exclaimed that if the fathers of the Church had accepted in the past the representation of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove, it was much more justifiable to accept the depiction of the Incarnated Logos, since he had been seen and touched on earth as a man.¹⁵⁶

An implication of this observation is that the Church accepted the depiction of the Holy Ghost as a dove because it was seen in this form during Christ’s Baptism (*Matthew* 3:16, *Mark* 1:10, *Luke* 3:22, *John* 1:32). A similar line of thinking is more often presented in iconophile texts in connection to angels. It is claimed that God’s incorporeal messengers are spiritual beings, but having been seen in bodily form by certain virtuous men of the Bible, they can be depicted in images – and such images were indeed recorded in various earlier patristic texts, testifying to a long tradition accepted by the Church. Consequently, it is even more justifiable to represent Christ in icons, since he did not only appear in a human body, but really acquired the human nature.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, likewise to the depiction of the Holy Ghost, the representation of angels in the ninth-century marginal psalters has in itself strong iconophile connotations.¹⁵⁸

There is further reason to suggest a more specific iconophile significance for the dove on David’s psalter on folio 147v of the Chludov Psalter. It is a firm tenet in Christian texts, including iconophile works, to consider the defeat of heresy and the reinstatement of peace in the Church as having been guided by the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁹ It is therefore eminently appropriate to use a dove to indicate that David (himself a prominent biblical model of ecclesiastical or political leaders in Byzantine culture)

¹⁵⁶ *Mansi* XIII, 181E-184B.

¹⁵⁷ John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 130-132 (III, 24-25); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 2A, 5E, 164E-165C, 404D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus II*, PG 100, 348-353, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 781AC; Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 341A, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 177 (epistle 64:36-37), 533-534 (385:11-14), 536 (386:50-51), 585 (418:35-36). For this and other iconophile arguments on the depiction of angels in icons see Parry (1996), 81-88, and especially Peers (2001), 65-66, 78, 81, 103-141.

¹⁵⁸ See also p. 210 below.

¹⁵⁹ See, for example: Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* II, 777C; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 593B, 1144C-E, 1209C, 1284C; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VI, 628AB, 633A, 672E; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 497C, 685E, 709A, 720AB, 937C, 296B; Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1138E, *Mansi* XIII, 408A/E; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 192B, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 540A, 564A, 597D, 616AB, 741B, *Apologeticus minor*, PG 100, 840C. See also Crehan (1966).

was inspired by the Holy Ghost to kill the heretic beasts that threatened his flock, and thereby to reinstate order and harmony. In this sense David is reminiscent here of Christ-Orpheus calming with the playing of his lyre the souls of those who embrace his Christian teaching. The miniature also recalls St Paul's words when warning the Church elders against the wolves that will attack the herd, in Acts 20:28-29: "Guard yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers."

Some texts written by or for prominent iconophiles describe the spiritual leaders of the Church as musical instruments inspired by the Holy Ghost (in continuation of a pre-existing literary tradition),¹⁶⁰ sometimes with specific reference to the flock of Christians saved by the God-sent sound of Orthodox teaching. For example, the iconophile Michael Synkellos in his *Vita Dionysii Areopagitae* says that the saint used a shepherd's pipe and songs to call sheep that were lost back to the flock, an obvious reference to the inspired teaching of Dionysios that had brought sinners back to the Church.¹⁶¹ The leading iconophile Theodore the Studite is called "the lyre of the Spirit".¹⁶² Theodore himself, when writing to Pope Pascal about the wild wolves of iconoclasm that had attacked the Orthodox Church, pleads with him to defeat the heretic beasts with the pipe of his divine teaching.¹⁶³ Likewise, Patriarch Nikephoros writes at the time of his appointment to Pope Leo III, asking his blessing in order to sound "the divine pipe of apostolic and spiritual teaching" and gather together the flock of the Church, keeping it safe from the attacks of wild beasts.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, the biographer of Nikephoros writes that the patriarch "tuned a musical lyre" not like the one of the ancient philosophers Pythagoras and Aristoxenos, but one made of one hundred and fifty cords – David's psalms. With this instrument he saved his flock from Saul's illness, the evil spirit that leads to false beliefs and fights against Christ's economy – in other words he defeated iconoclasm like a New David, by sounding his psaltery.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁰ See Lampe (1961), 814, "λύρα".

¹⁶¹ PG 4, 648CD.

¹⁶² PG 99, 97B, 101B.

¹⁶³ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 400-401 (epistle 271:16-21/45-47).

¹⁶⁴ *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 193D-196A.

¹⁶⁵ *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 57BC. The verb of this passage is the same with that of Psalm 151:2. Nikephoros "Μουσικήν δὲ ἡρμόσατο λύραν"; likewise, David says "οἱ δάκτυλοί μου ἤρμωσαν ψαλτήριον".

It will be worthwhile to examine another miniature of the Chludov Psalter that shows the Holy Ghost as safeguarding the Orthodox Church, because it sheds additional light on the significance of the dove depicted on folio 147v.

Folio 62v of the Chludov Psalter

On folio 62v of the Chludov Psalter, Psalm 65:1-4 “Shout unto God, all the earth...Let all the earth worship thee, and sing to thee; let them sing to thy name” is illustrated with a representation of the Pentecost marked by an unusual iconographic feature (fig. 42).¹⁶⁶ The two groups of six apostles each upon whom the fire of the Holy Ghost descends from the sky are shown seated right and left of a throne on which is placed an open gospel, and on this stands the dove of the Holy Ghost.¹⁶⁷ When this throne is depicted in a Pentecost scene, the standard Byzantine iconography places it above the circle of apostles,¹⁶⁸ to occupy the celestial sphere from which descends the illumination of the Holy Ghost, inspiring Christ’s disciples to convert thousands of people of various nationalities to Christianity, according to Acts 2:1-41 (figs 43-44). This event was considered as the inauguration of the ecumenical Church of Christ, the beginning of the diffusion of his teaching to the world through the grace of the Holy Ghost.¹⁶⁹ Logically enough the Fathers of the ecumenical councils saw their meetings as a continuation of this venerable tradition,

¹⁶⁶ Ščepkina (1977), relates the miniature to verse 1, while Dufrenne (1978) to verse 4. In the facsimile edition the reference marks that appear at the right, and possibly also at the left of the miniature, are not visible in between the verses of Psalm 65:1-4 above the scene. The wording of all these verses (the earth praising God) fits the theme of the Pentecost (the beginning of the dissemination of Christianity to the world).

¹⁶⁷ In the bibliography this is usually called “the *Hetoimasia* of the throne” (referring to the prepared throne of the Second Coming of Christ), and from the twelfth century onwards a similar throne that appears in the decoration of the bema-area in Byzantine churches is indeed inscribed “*Hetoimasia*”. See Gioles (1990), 87-89, 90-94, and Mandas (2001), 202-215, for the theophanic, trinitarian and eucharistic symbolism of the throne when it appears alone or inserted in the scene of the Pentecost in the decoration of the bema-area, as opposed to the eschatological symbolism of the throne in representations of the Second Coming. See also Bogyay, “*Hetoimasia*”, *RbK* II, 1189-1202.

¹⁶⁸ As on folio 301r (fig. 44) of cod. Paris. gr. 510; (Omont [1929], pl. XLIV; Brubaker [1999], fig. 30); in a wall painting at the church of Kiliclar in Cappadocia (Jerphanion [1925-28], pl. 52); in the mosaic above the bema of Hosios Loukas in Phokis (fig. 43; Diez – Demus [1931], pl. XV; Chatzidaki [1996], fig. 11); in the mosaic of the west cupola of St Marco in Venice (Demus [1984], Plates, I, fig. 4; Bertoli [1986], fig. 100a-b). The last two mosaics are thought to reflect the ninth-century mosaic on the west cupola of St Apostles in Constantinople, now lost (Walter [1970], 207). The throne does not always make part of the Pentecost iconography, where sometimes the tongues of fire alone, with or without the Holy Spirit, are depicted (Bogyay, “*Hetoimasia*”, *RbK* II, 1198; see also note 177 below). For further bibliography see Brubaker (1999), 240, especially notes 7, 8.

¹⁶⁹ Walter (1970), 199; Mandas (2001), 202-210, especially 204, 208, 210.

declaring that inspiration by the Holy Ghost enabled them to reach decisions that would ensure the unity and expansion of the ecumenical Church of Christ.

The relation between the Pentecost and the ecumenical councils is implicit in all claims that the decisions of the latter were reached under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.¹⁷⁰ In the Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, which set the example for all the following councils, this relation is also explicitly stated through a direct reference to the events described in *Acts* 2.¹⁷¹ Moreover, the inauguration of the works of the Third Ecumenical Council took place on the Sunday of Pentecost, obviously in order to allude to the spiritual connection between the biblical and the contemporary event.¹⁷² Significant is also the fact that, according to the *Typikon of the Great Church* (St Sophia at Constantinople), the commemoration of the fathers that participated in the first six ecumenical councils was celebrated on the last Sunday before Pentecost, and emphasis was placed on their inspiration by the Holy Ghost.¹⁷³ It is not surprising that the iconography of ecumenical councils should have compositional similarities with that of the Pentecost.¹⁷⁴ For example, a comparison between the miniature of the Pentecost and that of the Second Ecumenical Council on folios 301r and 355r of cod. Paris. gr. 510 respectively reveals the following similarities (figs 44-45): the semi-circular disposition of the protagonists sitting on benches, other participants placed in the bottom corners of the page, and a throne with a book in a prominent position. In the Pentecost scene, the throne above the apostles supports a closed book surmounted by the Holy Ghost. In the council scene, the throne in the middle, between the Church Fathers, supports an open gospel, reflecting the usual practice at ecumenical councils where the enthroned book stood for the presence of Christ and of the Holy Ghost who had inspired the scriptures.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁰ See n. 159 above.

¹⁷¹ According to Walter (1970), 235, this direct connection does not appear in Byzantine theology. However, in the Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* II, 808A, it is said that by summoning the Fathers of the council Constantine I created “an image of the chorus of apostles” on the day of Pentecost. Reference is made to the ecumenical character of both events. It is even claimed that since all the participants of the council act in the name of God, their gathering is in a way superior to that of the people who had attended the events of *Acts* 2.

¹⁷² *Mansi* IV, 1329E. The significance of this connection is noted, for example, by Evagrius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Bidez – Parmentier (1964), 8:16-18 (I.3). He writes that the principal day of the council was the day of holy Pentecost “when the life-giving spirit visited us from on height”.

¹⁷³ Ed. Mateos (1962-63), II, 130.

¹⁷⁴ Walter (1970), 234-235.

¹⁷⁵ Walter (1970), 147-148, mentions that the enthronement of the gospel as symbol of the presence of Christ is attested in the Third Ecumenical Council (Ephesus, 431), while its display is also mentioned in other three ecumenical councils, the Fourth (Chalcedon 451), the Sixth (Constantinople III, 680), the Seventh (Nicea II, 787); also at the local councils of 860 and 869 at Constantinople. To these I add

Comparing the miniatures of the two codices shows that on folio 62v of the Chludov Psalter the throne with the open book relates more closely to the iconography of councils than the Pentecost. The throne is more a realistic object standing between the apostles than a symbol floating above their heads. While the dove belongs to the iconography of the Pentecost, it also relates closely to the symbolism of the enthroned gospel in the ecumenical councils, referring to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. In fact, there is a case where the image of the enthroned gospel surmounted by the dove is related to an ecumenical council. On folio 107v of the tenth-century cod. Paris. suppl. gr. 1085 (collection of ecclesiastical canons) such an image appears at the end of the canons of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (fig. 46),¹⁷⁶ obviously aimed to denote the divine inspiration of the relevant text. Analogous allusions may be attributed to the Pentecost scene on folio 62v of the Chludov Psalter, where the composition is reminiscent of the enthroned gospel amidst the participants of the ecumenical councils. The position of the throne among the apostles cannot be explained merely by lack of space above them where standard iconography would normally place it. Lack of space might have led to the omission of the throne, a solution that is frequently followed in Byzantine miniatures and portable icons (figs 47-49).¹⁷⁷ However, the artist has chosen to insert the throne between the apostles, on the same level with them, thus conferring on the scene a similarity with the iconography of the ecumenical councils. This is a positive rather than a negative pictorial decision.

This interpretation can be supported by a glance at the rest of folio 62v. We need to account for the representation of two deacons sounding the *simandron* with a

the reference to the gospel in two letters related to the Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople II, 550), *Mansi* IX, 188B, 189A/C. In the Sixth Ecumenical Council Walter notes “une brève allusion” to the presence of the gospel, but in reality the acts of this council give the most numerous references to this presence: *Mansi* XI, 324D, 381A, 460C, 521D, 553B, 585E, 605D, 616E, 629D (and 224E, 232D, mentioned by Walter [1970], 147, n.145). On folio 16r of the Pantokrator Psalter (fig. 18) the gospel is depicted on a bench amidst the participants of the iconoclastic council of 815, attesting to the widespread usage of the display of the Gospel in ecclesiastical councils, already known from the textual sources (Brubaker [1999], 212 with further bibliography).

¹⁷⁶ Walter (1970), 61, fig. 28.

¹⁷⁷ For example, in the nineteen depictions of the Pentecost in the illustrated codices with the liturgical homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus examined by Galavaris (1969), 80-81. In four of these miniatures lack of space has led to the representation of the scene not in its usual semicircular arrangement, but in a horizontal arrangement similar to that of the Chludov Psalter (figs 48-49). In these cases the space available between the two groups of apostles could have allowed the depiction of the throne, which is however omitted. For representations of the Pentecost in its semicircular arrangement without the throne, in portable icons dated from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, see Vokotopoulos (1995), figs 18, 36, 42, 83, 86, 107, 113, 131.

hammer to signal the beginning of the Divine Liturgy (the Mass) – a practice still followed in many Greek monasteries. The first deacon appears next to verse 12 of Psalm 64 “Thou wilt bless the crown of the year because of thy goodness; and thy plains shall be filled with fatness” which according to the *Typikon of the Great Church* was sung on September 1st, the first day of the ecclesiastical year, when the entire Psalm 64 was sung as the third antiphonal.¹⁷⁸ Now according to the *Ecclesiastical History* of Patriarch Germanos, sounding the *simandron* is not only a signal to the faithful to gather for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, but also a warning to evil spirits to keep away from the church. More precisely, the patriarch says that “The *simandron* represents the trumpets of the angels and calls the contestants to battle against the invisible enemies”.¹⁷⁹ The Chludov Psalter deacons may therefore be understood to be warning evil spirits to keep away from the church all the year round, given that they illustrate a psalm basic to the liturgical inauguration of the ecclesiastical year, and the first one of them appears next to verse 12 that was repeatedly sung at that feast. At the same time, reference marks relate the two deacons to verse 14 “The rams of the flock are clothed with wool, and the valleys shall abound in corn; they shall cry aloud, yea they shall sing hymns”. More specifically they relate them to the word “rams”, as if to indicate that by calling the congregation to attend Mass the deacons are the rams that lead the flock to thank God for his blessing of abundance and prosperity throughout the year, as described in Psalm 64:10-14.

The deacons may be considered complementary to the scene across the bottom of the page, which seems to convey the message that the Christian Church inaugurated at Pentecost is constantly safeguarded by the ecumenical councils. In fact, the same reference mark that is painted above each deacon reappears not only above Psalm 64:14, but also above Psalm 65:1.¹⁸⁰ The allusion to the perpetual liturgical cycle of the Church through the figures of the deacons reveals the contemporary and

¹⁷⁸ Ed. Mateos (1962-63), I, 8. Psalm 64:12 was also part of a troparion that was sung twice on September 1st according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos (1962-63), I, 4:16-17, 8:14. The same psalm verse is extensively employed in the celebration of September 1st according to the twelfth-century *Typikon of the Monastery of the Saviour* at Messina (following Studite practice, see p. 228, n. 866 below). It is not only used as *stichos* at the eve of the feast, and at the Divine Liturgy of the feast proper, it is also the *koinonikon*, sung during Communion (ed. Arranz [1969], 12-14).

¹⁷⁹ *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Meyendorff (1984), 56-59 (§2).

¹⁸⁰ Ščepkina (1977), relates the deacons to Psalm 64:12, but the reference marks clearly relate them to Psalm 64:14 (mentioned by Dufrenne [1978]), and Psalm 65:1. Likewise, two deacons appear on folio 106v of the Barberini Psalter in relation to both psalms (Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989], 94), while on folio 80v of the Theodore Psalter they are related only to Psalm 65:1 (Der Nersessian [1970], 36, fig. 129).

continuous relevance of Pentecost for the life of the Church. As in the inauguration of ecumenical Christianity (Pentecost) and in the reaffirmation of its ecumenical Orthodox values (the councils), so in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy (the central event in the life of the Church) the Holy Ghost descends to bestow the divine grace on God's people. In fact, the belief of the Orthodox Church in the descent of the Holy Ghost during the Divine Liturgy is considered a main reason for the representation of the Pentecost or of the *Hetoimasia* of the throne in the bema of Byzantine churches.¹⁸¹ Folio 62v of the Chludov Psalter presents a different visual expression of the same idea, with emphasis on the polemical significance of the Divine Liturgy and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the fight against evil spirits (*simandron*-sounding) and heretics (reference to the ecumenical councils).

In the double meaning attributed to the miniature of the Pentecost (interpreted as referring to the inauguration of the ecumenical Church of Christ and to the ecumenical councils that ensure the unity and perpetuation of the Church), the dove on the throne performs a function similar to that on folio 147v, where it appears on David's psaltery. This miniature too expresses a double meaning: it represents David not only as the psalmist composing his psalms under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but also as biblical symbol of an ecclesiastical pastor who, guided by the Holy Ghost, brings peace and safety to his flock once he has killed the iconoclastic beasts that threatened the unity and life of his herd.

Folio 148r of the Chludov Psalter

The killing of Goliath on folio 148r (fig. 23), an episode specifically mentioned in Psalm 151:6-7, may be another allusion to the defeat of the iconoclastic heresy.¹⁸² The confrontation between good and evil was considered in Byzantium as a spiritual war, and the words used to describe it were often those of the battlefield, sometimes following closely the phraseology of *Ephesians* 6:10-17, where the spiritual armour of the Christians is described as made of the breast-plate of righteousness, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the

¹⁸¹ Mandas (2001), 202-215.

¹⁸² "I went forth to meet the Philistine; and he cursed me by his idols. But I drew his own sword, and beheaded him, and removed reproach from the children of Israel".

spirit.¹⁸³ Such *topoi* are frequently employed in iconophile polemics.¹⁸⁴ For example, the iconophile patriarchs Germanos and Methodios, as well as Theodore the Studite, were described in iconophile texts as fighting a spiritual battle against heretics.¹⁸⁵ Theodore himself often used in his epistles the term “soldiers of Christ” when speaking of persecuted iconophiles who fight against heresy.¹⁸⁶ Moreover, the Seventh Ecumenical Council declared that the enemies of the spiritual Jerusalem, meaning the ecumenical Church of Christ, were in certain ways the same as those who had attacked the earthly Jerusalem.¹⁸⁷ This is, of course, an expression of the Byzantines believing that they were the new chosen people of God who were continuing the history of the Old Israel.

In their spiritual war against heretics, the leaders of the New Israel, the emperors of Byzantium and the Fathers of the Orthodox Church, were often compared to David who defeated Goliath, one of the most notorious enemies of the Old Israel (*I.Kings* 17). For example, the Third Ecumenical Council declared that the Orthodox Christians, the soldiers of Christ, will triumph over the heretic enemy even if he is as insolent as Goliath, and compared the stones that David placed in his shepherd-scrip to use against the Philistine (*I Kings* 17:40) with the valorous Christians that fight for the true faith in Christ’s Church.¹⁸⁸ The Sixth Ecumenical Council described

¹⁸³ Mango (1980), 159. For a few examples see Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1041A/E, 1047CD, 1285B/D; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 629E, 668BC, 684D, 720E; Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 273 (§1073, Psalm 117:5-9), 300 (§1157, Psalm 121:6-7), 343 (§1245, Psalm 143:1); Cyril of Alexandria, *Festive Letters*, SC 372, 244-246 (IV,2:38-44), 282 (V,1:18-23), SC 392, 127-128 (IX,2:1-17), 254 (XI,2:12-22); Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 195 (X,5:38), 198 (X,5:65-66), 259 (XIV,1:70-71); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), III, 32 (epistle 284:1034-1036), 43 (284:1379), 101 (285:86-90). In most of the above excerpts the spiritual battle described is fought against heretics. See also the iconophile texts mentioned in the following pages.

¹⁸⁴ For some examples of iconophile references to the spiritual war against heresy see Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 176C, 177C, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 208A, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 493D, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 202 (§114:53-66); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 65D-68A, 85B, 88A, 112B, 116A. For other references see the following notes.

¹⁸⁵ *Vita Germani*, ed. Lamza (1975), 206:97-98 (Germanos is the stronghold of Orthodoxy); Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-1977), V, 80:19-23 (Germanos kills the heretics with the sword of truth); *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1260C (Methodios drives away the army of iconoclasts and demolishes their fortress); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 802:23 (Methodios is a fighter in the first lines of Orthodoxy); *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 97C, 249C (Theodore is the weapon of righteousness, he is experienced in the spiritual battle, armed with the weapons of light, i.e. scriptural testimonies); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 78 (§16:10, Theodore is an excellent fighter and enemy of those who turn against the Church).

¹⁸⁶ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 201 (epistle 81:11), 244 (126:2), 254 (135:5), 284 (163:2), 290 (169:11), 295 (174:2), 298 (177:20), 314 (190:17), 322 (199:13), 366 (232:28-29), 378 (246:15), 380 (248:5-6), 498 (365:14-15), 524 (381:102), 638 (451:15-16).

¹⁸⁷ *Mansi* XIII, 221DE.

¹⁸⁸ *Mansi* IV, 1340E-1341A.

Constantine IV, who summoned the Synod, as a second David, fighting the heretic Goliath with spiritual weapons.¹⁸⁹ A more generic comparison between David, the king of Holy Zion, and the Byzantine emperors that summon the clergy to defend the New Zion, the Orthodox Church, was also made in the Acts of the Fourth and the Seventh Ecumenical Council.¹⁹⁰ In his dogmatic treatise *Viae Dux*, Anastasios of Sinai declares twice that he will stone and vanquish his heretic opponents following the example of David in his battle with Goliath.¹⁹¹

Similar typological expressions abound in texts of iconophile writers. In his *Vita Dionysii Areopagitae*, the iconophile Michael the Synkellos describes the saint as “another David”, fighting victoriously against the enemies of Christianity.¹⁹² More significantly, the biographer of Theodore the Studite says that this militant iconophile struck and overcame the iconoclasts with his three antirrhetical discourses, like David who struck Goliath dead with a stone (I Kings 17:49).¹⁹³ When writing that with this victory Theodore lifted the heavy reproach from the Church (“τὸν δεινότατον ὀνειδισμόν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξῆρπεν”), the biographer in fact uses a vocabulary very similar to Psalm 151:7, in which David says that by killing Goliath he “removed reproach from the children of Israel” (“ἡρᾶ ὀνειδος ἐξ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ”). Theodore the Studite writes at the beginning of his third *Antirrheticus* that David overcame Goliath with only one stone, while the writer himself, being inexperienced in war, will attempt to defeat iconoclast beliefs with three discourses.¹⁹⁴ The term “ἀλλόφυλος” (foreign) used in this text to denote that iconoclasm is not intrinsic to Orthodoxy, is also employed in Psalm 151:6 to describe Goliath the Philistine (as also in I.Kings 17). Likewise, the success of Nicholas Studite in his fight against iconoclasts is compared in his *Vita* to David’s performance in battle.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, the biographer of Methodios writes that this patriarch was David’s imitator and successor, defeating iconoclasts who were slandering the Incarnation of the Logos by using “the cornerstone”, in other words Christ’s true body, similarly to David who defeated

¹⁸⁹ *Mansi* XI, 736AC.

¹⁹⁰ *Mansi* VII, 169C; *Mansi* XIII, 408CD.

¹⁹¹ Ed. Uthermann (1981), 138 (IX,1:100-101), 315 (XXIV:14-21).

¹⁹² *PG* 4, 636C.

¹⁹³ *PG* 99, 265A.

¹⁹⁴ *PG* 99, 389A.

¹⁹⁵ *PG* 105, 920C.

Goliath with a stone loosed from his sling.¹⁹⁶ Methodios is also compared to David and St Peter because, like them, he strikes and defeats those who slander him.¹⁹⁷ To these specifically anti-iconoclastic examples one should add that in the literary tradition of the Byzantine Church David's combat with Goliath was often considered as a type of Christ's victory over death,¹⁹⁸ or as an allegory of man conquering his passions.¹⁹⁹ In other words, the typological and tropological interpretation of this biblical episode was not confined to texts concerning the defeat of heresy.

Most of these passages speak of Goliath's defeat by David's sling, since that sling-shot was the decisive moment in their combat (*I.Kings* 17:48-49).²⁰⁰ On folio 148r of the Chludov Psalter Goliath's beheading is depicted instead, since this is the event specifically mentioned in Psalm 151:7. Being the final act of the combat, it seals David's victory over the enemy. In this sense it can be also taken to allude to the final triumph of iconophiles over iconoclasts, the miniature complementing the textual references to the "heretic" Goliath's defeat by David's sling. Indeed, in their spiritual war against iconoclasm the iconophile writers sometimes mention "the sling of the spirit",²⁰¹ but they preferred to use "the sword of the spirit", in other words the weapon David used to kill Goliath according to Psalm 151:7.²⁰² It is worth mentioning that while in *I.Kings* 17:51 the Philistine's sword with which David beheads him is called "*ρόμφαλα*", the sword mentioned in iconophile polemics as the spiritual weapon employed against iconoclasm is called "*μάχαιρα*", as in Psalm 151:7. The same word is used in various Christian texts that make reference to the spiritual sword with which is fought the battle of Orthodoxy against heresy.²⁰³

¹⁹⁶ PG 100, 1260C.

¹⁹⁷ PG 100, 1257B.

¹⁹⁸ For example, Theodoret, *In librum I Regnorum*, PG 80, 565B; John Chrysostom, *Laudatio SS. Drosidis martyris* PG 50, 687 (mentioning that as Goliath was beheaded by his own sword, so the devil was defeated by his own instrument, the woman, since after Eve came the Virgin Mary who gave birth to Christ the Logos).

¹⁹⁹ For example, Gregory Nazianzenus, SC 358, 232, (discourse 40, §17:1-3).

²⁰⁰ In the passage mentioned in note 189 above, reference is made also to Goliath's beheading. In the texts mentioned in notes 195 and 197 the reference is generally to the combat of David and Goliath.

²⁰¹ Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 205D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 196C, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 228C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 329 (§205:3).

²⁰² Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1123D, *Mansi* XIII, 128B, 205C/E, 301C, 360A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 196C, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 812CD; *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 284A.

²⁰³ For example, Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), I, 203 (§138, Psalm 17:35); Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1340A/E; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 660E, 720B, 932C; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 156 (X.1, 2:157-158); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-1985), I, 40 (epistle 2:15-18).

The key biblical passage that seems to have inspired the usage of this word in such polemical texts is *Ephesians* 6:17, where “the sword of the spirit” is identified with “the word of God”.²⁰⁴ According to the usual expressions of iconophile literature, this “sword of the spirit” is used by iconophiles to defeat and uproot heretic beliefs in the spiritual war where the combat is between ideas, not human warriors. There is, however, an excerpt in the *Apologeticus* by Patriarch Nikephoros where it is quite literally stated that the Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, protected by the Holy Ghost and armed with the weapons of piety, “cut off the heads of their iniquitous enemies” (with their decisions against iconoclasm).²⁰⁵ Likewise, in a homily delivered at the council of 867 intended by Photios as a definite condemnation against all heresies,²⁰⁶ the patriarch describes in similar terms the victory of Orthodoxy over heresy, by making specific reference to Goliath’s beheading. Photios says that while David killed only one foreigner and left alive others that could be a future threat to Israel, the Byzantine emperors Michael III and Basil I, who summoned the council of 867, defeated all heresies by “the sword of the Cross”, making the victory complete and bestowing “on the whole body of the Church a profound and undisturbed peace”.²⁰⁷

The prominence of the sword in the miniature of Goliath’s beheading (folio 148r of the Chludov Psalter, fig. 23) may be a reflection of the emphasis on “the sword of the spirit” as employed by iconophile writers. In Byzantine art, and especially in illustrated Byzantine psalters, David is usually seen with the sword on his enemy’s neck, either cutting or piercing it (figs 50-55).²⁰⁸ This seems to be the norm in codices that do not belong to the tradition of marginal-psalter illustration. Of 73 manuscripts examined, 22 illustrations of the event survive in 20 codices (Table 2).²⁰⁹ Only in four cases does the sword not touch Goliath’s neck. Once David holds it

²⁰⁴ “... τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ῥῆμα θεοῦ...”.

²⁰⁵ PG 100, 597C.

²⁰⁶ Mango (1958), 302.

²⁰⁷ Homily XVIII, ed. Laourdas (1959), 179:10-27, trans. Mango (1958), 314.

²⁰⁸ For the psalters see below. For Goliath’s decapitation in the illustrated *Book of Kings*, cod. Vat. gr. 333, folio 24r (fig. 53), Lassus (1973) 53, fig. 43. For representations of the event in other media see, for example, the biggest of the Cyprus plates (fig. 50) and the ivory casket in the Palazzo Venezia, Rome (fig. 51), mentioned in n. 78 above. In these artefacts David is shown holding the sword against Goliath’s neck. By contrast, in the wall-painting of chapel III at Bawit with scenes from David’s life (dated from the first quarter of the sixth century to the beginning of the eighth, Cutler [1978], 61, n. 156), David raises the sword high above Goliath’s head, holding in with flexed arm in a realistically attacking pose (Buchthal [1938], fig. 31).

²⁰⁹ (Cod. Vat. gr. 752 includes three such scenes [Table 2, numbers 2-4]). From the 85 psalters listed in Lowden (1988), 259, the nine marginal ones are mentioned below. From the remaining 76, I have not

in front of him, once he is inserting it in its sheath, and twice he raises it above his right shoulder, ready to strike the death blow (figs 56-59).²¹⁰ Never once does he stretch his arm to hold the sword high above his head as in the Chludov Psalter. This iconographic version seems to belong specifically to the tradition of marginal-psalter illustration, probably from the ninth century onwards, since the Stuttgart and the Bristol Psalters, which reflect an earlier tradition, both depict the sword as touching Goliath's neck.²¹¹

The earliest surviving example of the weapon brandished up high is the miniature on folio 148r of the Chludov Psalter, where David with a straight arm holds up the sword vertically, more as a symbol demonstrating his victory than as its instrument. This element differentiates the Chludov miniature even from the later codices that follow the tradition of marginal-psalter illustration where the sword does not touch Goliath's neck but is raised above his head ready to give the death blow. In the eleventh-century Theodore Psalter, and in the fourteenth-century Hamilton, Tomič, Kiev, and Munich Psalters, David is shown in a clearly attacking pose, his flexed arm holding the sword either above or in front of him and away from his victim's throat (figs 60-63, 27).²¹² Similar realistically offensive poses are assumed by various figures also in the Chludov Psalter itself in scenes of decapitation, sacrifice, etc (e.g. figs 64-65).²¹³ But on folio 148r David's pose is triumphant rather than combative, and the sword held up high becomes more an emblem of victory than a weapon.

been able to obtain a description of their illustration in three cases: cod. gr. 214, the Public Library in St Petersburg; cod. gr. 2123, Monastery of the St Catherine on Mount Sinai; and cod. B.X.33, University Library in Basel (Lowden [1988], 259, numbers 38, 79, 85). In the case of cod. 240 of the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome, the laconic reference of Bancalari (1894), 170-171, that David is depicted on folio 3v, suggests that he appears alone as shepherd-musician, or as king-psalmist in the *incipit* of the psalter, and not in a narrative scene like Goliath's beheading. (See also note 122 above).

²¹⁰ Table 2, numbers 2, 13-15. Also on folio 91r of cod. Paris. gr. 923 (copy of the *Sacra Parallela*, ninth century) David holds the sword in front of him, close to Goliath's head (Weitzmann [1979], 78-79, fig. 119).

²¹¹ Stuttgart Psalter, folio 165r, De Wald (1930a), 112; Bristol Psalter, folio 240r, Dufrenne (1966), 65, pl. 59. In the Utrecht Psalter, folio 91v (De Wald [1930], 72, pl. CXLIV) David has already beheaded Goliath and is depicted holding his enemy's head in one hand and his sword in the other.

²¹² Theodore Psalter, folio 191r, Der Nersessian (1970), 58, fig. 299; Hamilton Psalter, folio 43v, Havice (1978), 371; Kiev Psalter, folio 205r, Vzdornov (1978); Tomič Psalter, folio 248r, Džurova (1990); Munich Psalter, folio 186r, Dufrenne *et alii* (1978). The relevant folio is not illustrated in the Sinai marginal Psalter (Weitzmann [1980], 1), and is missing from the Pantokrator Psalter, the Paris marginal Psalter, the Barberini Psalter and the marginal Psalter in the Walters Art Gallery (Corrigan [1992], 145; Dufrenne [1966], 41; Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989], 144; Miner [1955], 233).

²¹³ See the beheading of martyrs (folio 44r, fig. 102) and of the Maccabees (folio 79r, fig. 100), the massacre of the innocents (folio 92r fig. 64), the Sacrifice of Isaac (folio 105v, fig. 65), the Sacrifice of the daughters and sons of Israel (folios 109v-110r, figs 88-89).

These elements can be taken as indicating a second layer of meaning: that the scene represents a symbolic battle against the spiritual enemies of the New Israel, the Orthodox Church. Side by side with the slaying of the wild beasts on the facing folio, the decapitation of Goliath may be considered as another emphatic allusion to the defeat of iconoclasm. On folios 147v and 148r, the correlation of the combat against the animals and against the Philistine recalls *I.Kings* 17:34-37/47, where David declares that since God has helped him kill the lions and bears attacking his flock when he was a shepherd, he will likewise help him defeat Goliath who threatens his people, since true victory is won through faith in God and not through the use of man-made weapons.²¹⁴ This is also the underlying message in iconophile references to the war against iconoclasm, with weapons that are spiritual and their effectiveness is due to the piety and faith of the Orthodox Christians using them.

The two compositions illustrating Psalm 151 in the Chludov Psalter are among the most revealing miniatures of the codex for understanding how iconography was used to communicate an iconophile interpretation of the texts and demonstrating that the imagery operates on several layers of meaning. The composition of the scenes on the basis of antitheses and analogies contributes to the same end. The interrelationship of different miniatures on the same folio or on facing folios deliberately constructs an elaborate iconophile message (as on folios 23v and 24r, and folio 62v, examined above). This device is used throughout the manuscript, and will be further studied in the next chapters, offering us additional evidence of the sophistication and complexity of theological references inherent in the visual language of the ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters.

²¹⁴ This point is emphasized in various Byzantine texts that mention David's combat with Goliath. For example, in a spurious homily *In psalmum L* by John Chrysostom, PG 55, 569-570, it is said that David did not use Saul's armour and weapons against Goliath, so that his victory would not be attributed to them (*I.Kings* 17:38-40). Instead, he was armed with faith and piety, weapons that give to a fighter much greater strength. The same text was included in the florilegium of *Sacra Parallela*, PG 96, 117D-120A, under the title "On repentance and confession". Theodore (in *librum I Regnorum*, PG 80, 565B, 568AB) makes a similar comment. Moreover, he compares Goliath with the wild animals that David killed as a shepherd, because "the man who lives in impiety is no different from beasts".

II.2 Scenes of Jewish history as typological allusions to the life of the New Israel

Biblical events of Jewish history are a basic subject of ninth-century marginal psalter illustration, since they are frequently mentioned in the psalms.²¹⁵ This section will examine a number of scenes illustrating Psalms 73, 77, 78, 105, and the first Ode of Moses. Reference will be made to all three ninth-century marginal psalters, but especially to the Chludov Psalter, which preserves the largest number of miniatures and is characterized by greater compositional sophistication. The combination of Old and New Testament scenes in the illustration of Psalms 73 and 77 will be related to theological arguments of iconophile literature concerning the Christological dogma of the Orthodox Church and its reflection in icon veneration. The main theme of this section will, however, be the possible typological allusions of Old Testament miniatures to the iconophile-iconoclast conflict, using as guidelines relevant references in iconophile texts, as well as the iconographic and compositional peculiarities of the scenes in question.

As will become evident from the examples analysed below, some of these miniatures must have been part of the tradition of psalter illustration before the ninth century, judging by the evidence of the Utrecht, the Stuttgart and the Bristol Psalters.²¹⁶ Others may have been newly added or iconographically and compositionally altered in the post-iconoclast period, in which case we must be alert to the possibility that one of the reasons for these additions and changes were the iconophile connotations of the relevant scenes. In some cases, such as Psalm 73 and the first Ode of Moses, an Old Testament episode is shown in one self-contained composition, favouring an autonomous interpretation aimed to disclose a probable iconophile message below the layer of biblical narration. In the case of for instance Psalms 77 and 105, the episodes described refer to a long sequence of events from *Exodus* and other books of the Bible, so that their illustration requires quite a number of miniatures painted on consecutive pages.²¹⁷

²¹⁵ Corrigan (1992), 14 ff.

²¹⁶ See also Corrigan (1992), 14-20.

²¹⁷ Chludov Psalter, Psalm 77, folios 76r-79r; Psalm 105, folios 108r-110r. Pantokrator Psalter, Psalm 77, folios 102v-109v; Psalm 105, folios 153r-154r. Paris marginal Psalter, Psalm 105, folios 16r-18r.

Although most of these biblical episodes appear also in iconophile literature for their theological or typological relevance, some of them are much more frequently mentioned, and so offer more opportunities for an interpretative analysis. The same biblical episodes are also signalled out in the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters, being arranged in self-contained compositional units that make them stand out from the wider sequence of miniatures to which they belong, and invite the viewer to read them autonomously. This indicates that they were deliberately planned to convey a message that transcends straightforward literal illustration of a biblical story. For this reason I decided to examine the illustration of Psalms 77 and 105 not as a whole, but focus more specifically on some of those miniatures that make up such self-contained openings – in the former case also incorporating the illustration of Psalm 78. Since this section is based on typological interpretations of Jewish history, the miniatures will be examined in the chronological order of the events depicted, from the crossing of the Red Sea and related episodes to the story of Phineas, the captivity of the Jews to the Babylonians and their suffering at the hands of Antiochos Epiphanis. The same sequence is dictated by the nature of the scenes examined: from the simpler compositions that allow a more straightforward analysis, to the more complex cases, the interpretation of which is corroborated by analysis of the miniatures examined before them.

Exodus from the land of heresy

The ninth-century marginal psalters contain a large number of miniatures illustrating various events from the book of *Exodus*. Psalms 77, 104 and 105 present a long sequence of relevant episodes,²¹⁸ while Psalms 73, 80 and the first Ode of Moses are illustrated with single scenes.²¹⁹ The rich literary tradition of Byzantium on the exegesis of *Exodus* can shed some light on the way these miniatures were understood by their ninth century viewers.

²¹⁸ For Psalms 77 and 105 see the previous note, and pp. 97-119 below. The illustration of Psalm 104 in the Chludov Psalter takes up folios 105v-107r; in the Pantokrator Psalter folios 149v-151v; in the Paris marginal Psalter folios 13r-15r.

²¹⁹ For Psalm 73 and the first Ode of Moses see pp. 83-96 below. Psalm 80 is illustrated with Moses extracting water from the rock of Mara on folio 82r of the Chludov Psalter, and folio 114r of the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 182-83).

As early as in the New Testament, major episodes from *Exodus* were interpreted as prophecies on the Incarnation of the Logos for the salvation of humanity,²²⁰ and this Christological typology was further developed in Early Christian and Byzantine literature,²²¹ including commentaries on the psalms.²²² In this kind of exegesis Moses was seen as prefiguring Christ who defeats the devil in the guise of the Pharaoh and saves the New Israel (of the Christians) from the land of idolatry and sin. The illustration of Psalms 73, 77, and 80 in the Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters presents some aspects of this Christological exegesis.²²³

Alongside this reading, another typological interpretation developed from the Early Christian period onwards, which saw the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt and their long journey to the promised land as a type of the soul's struggle to overcome sin and find the way to spiritual and moral perfection. In his *De vita Moysis*, popular in the Byzantine period, Gregory of Nyssa produced the most systematic tropological reading of this kind on *Exodus*.²²⁴ Another branch of this rich typological exegetical tradition, widely developed in Early Christian and Byzantine literature, saw the Israelites' deliverance from slavery to the Egyptians as a type for the salvation of the Church from its heretic persecutors.²²⁵ This idea originates, of

²²⁰ See Danielou (1960a), 153-166.

²²¹ Danielou (1960a), 167-201. The Fathers either make a generic reference to *Exodus* as prefiguring the salvation of the world by Christ, or mention specific events as types of Christian sacraments instituted by Christ (usually the crossing of the Red Sea referring to baptism, the miracle of the manna or the rock to the Eucharist, etc). On generic references to salvation see, for example, Gregory Nazianzenus, *In sanctum pascha*, PG 36, 644A-C, 649B-652D; Epiphanius of Cyprus (*dubia*), *In sancto et magno sabbato*, PG 43, 441C, *In sanctam Christi resurrectionem*, PG 43, 468C-469C; Proclus of Constantinople, *In sanctum pascha*, PG 65, 796C-797B; Leontios presbyter, *Homilies*, ed. Datema – Allen (1987), 313 (homily X, trans. Allen – Datema [1991], 122); Patriarch Germanos, *In dominici corporis sepulturam*, PG 98, 280; John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 176:43-46 (77, IV.4). On the crossing of the Red Sea as a type of baptism see p. 84, n. 240 below.

²²² For example, Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 913-21, and Pseudo-Athanasios *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 972-73, 981, interpret Christologically various *Exodus* references of Psalm 77. See also pp. 84-85 below for Psalm 73.

²²³ For the depiction of Christ's Baptism in relation to psalm 73:13 referring to the crossing of the Red Sea, see p. 84 below. For Christ teaching the Jews that he is the true bread of life in relation to Psalm 77:24-25 mentioning the manna (Chludov Psalter, folios 76r-v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 105r; figs 182-83) see Corrigan (1992), 50-51. For the image of Christ next to Moses striking the rock illustrating Psalm 80:17 (Chludov Psalter, folio 82r; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 114r) see Corrigan (1992), 91.

²²⁴ Ed. and trans. in French Danielou (1955), comments on pp. XIV-XXIV; see also Danielou (1960a), 217-26 with comments on this and other similar tropological interpretations of *Exodus*. See also Andrew of Crete, *Magnus canon*, PG 97, 1356A-1360A.

²²⁵ For example, Epiphanius of Cyprus compares the defeat of Arianism to the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, *Panarion*, PG 42, 333AB; in the Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council, *Mansi III*, 532C, heresy is considered worse than the ninth plague (of darkness) that fell upon Egypt; in the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi VI*, 1389B, heresy is described as "an Egyptian tempest"; Michael the Synkellos, *Vita Dionysii Areopagitae*, PG 4, 633C-636A, compares the Athenian saint to Moses (leading the New Israel out of the land of idolatry upon which he had inflicted

course, in the belief that Christians are the new chosen people of God, and another expression of it is found in the comparison made by Eusebios of Caesarea (and repeated by later authors) between Moses drowning the Pharaoh in the Red Sea and Constantine I defeating Maxentius at the Milvian bridge.²²⁶

All these kinds of typological interpretation of *Exodus* share basic common elements, like conflating the Pharaoh with the devil or his servants (demons, heretics, impious men and thoughts), and reading the deliverance from Egypt as a type for moral and spiritual salvation (of humanity by Christ, of the Church by Orthodox leaders, of individual souls by the principles of the Christian life and the search for perfection). The long and multifaceted tradition of typological exegesis applied to *Exodus* suggests that the Byzantine audience was familiar with looking for a second layer of meaning behind the biblical narrative. However, what is most significant for an interpretation of the *Exodus* miniatures in the ninth-century marginal psalters is the typological use of the *Exodus* in iconophile texts so as to point to the conflict between Orthodoxy and heresy. In this kind of ecclesiological typology, various episodes and figures from this Old Testament book are viewed as parallel to events and personalities of the iconoclast period. The iconoclast emperors are referred to as “second Pharaohs”,²²⁷ and their impious ideas are considered worse than the plague of darkness that descended on Egypt.²²⁸ The utter iniquity of the iconoclast heresy, which enslaved the chosen people of Orthodox Christianity to a new and wicked Pharaoh, is said to have roused the wrath of God, who punished the kingdom of the iconoclast emperor with calamities that closely recall the plagues of Egypt, although

not ten but a thousand plagues, and drowning the Pharaoh-devil and his forces of deception and heresy); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 544:7-8, compares the emperor Julian to the Pharaoh; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), 17 (epistle 284:483) describes Arius as “the Egyptian evil”. A great number of such typological references appear in iconophile texts concerning the confrontation of Orthodoxy and iconoclasm; see below, pp. 81-83.

²²⁶ Eusebios, *Historiae ecclesiasticae*, PG 20, 821AC (IX,9); in the ninth century repeated, for example, by George the Monk, *Ghronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 488:6-11. For the comparison of Byzantine emperors to Moses, Dagron (1996), 114; Brubaker (1999), 221; see also pp. 92, 116 below.

²²⁷ Constantine V as Pharaoh in: Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 220C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 79 (36:22-25); *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 236B, 237D. Leo V as Pharaoh in: Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 416 (epistle 278:40), 583 (417:20-21), 587 (419:16); Emperor Theophilos as Pharaoh in: George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 798:18-19, 800:11/15. See also *Epistola Gregorii papae ad Germanum*, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XIII*, 92E.

²²⁸ Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 195 (74:23-26); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 83 (§13:1-4).

they are not directly related to them in the literature.²²⁹ The defeat of the iconoclasts and the liberation of Christians from heresy is celebrated as another deliverance from Egypt, and a second crossing of the Red Sea, where the iconoclast Pharaoh and his followers are drowned, and the New Israel of the iconophile believers in Christ is saved and free to enter the promised land of the Orthodox Church.²³⁰ Iconophile leaders are compared to Moses,²³¹ while prominent iconoclasts are called Iannes and Iambres, the two sorcerers of the Pharaoh who plotted against God's prophet (*Exodus* 7:11, *II.Timothy* 3:8).²³² Especially John the Grammarian, patriarch under the "new Pharaoh" Theophilos, is frequently called the "second Iannes" – a comparison no doubt partly suggested by the resonance between the names Ioannes and Iannes.²³³

John the Grammarian is inscribed "Iannes" in two of the four miniatures in which he appears in the Chludov Psalter. On folio 35v (fig. 4), where he is depicted as a demonic sorcerer with his hair standing on end, holding a snake in his left hand, and

²²⁹ Patriarch Nikephoros, *Chronographia brevis*, ed. De Boor (1880), 62:24-64:9, describes a plague that killed thousands of people throughout the Byzantine empire in the year 747 as God's punishment for iconoclasm. During the reign of Constantine V he also mentions disastrous earthquakes, fall of meteorites, and an unparalleled heavy winter in the year 764, but without explicitly relating them to iconoclasm (De Boor [1880], 64:23-65:5, 65:13-23, 67:4-68:26). However, he describes exactly the same calamities as signs of God's wrath for the iconoclast policy of Constantine V in his *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 496A-501A, and his *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 50 (§23:30-49). The *Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Theophilos*, ed. Munitiz et alii (1997), 75-77 (§13.a), describes various God-sent calamities (plague, earthquakes, floods, wars) as punishment for impiety, employing biblical quotations. Pseudo-Damasenos, *Letter to Theophilos*, ed. Munitiz et alii (1997), 171 (§14.c), mentions disastrous natural phenomena as a result of the iconoclast blasphemy of Leo III. Similar God-sent calamities during the reign of Leo III and Theophilos are described by George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 777:19-778:7, 797:25-798:7; and in the *Life of Empress Theodora*, ed. Markopoulos (1983), 263 (§7). Likewise in Theodore the Studite's *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 249 (epistle 132:2-8), 696 (478:27-30).

²³⁰ Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XIII*, 454D; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 24 (epistle 7:18-19); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 149 (§57); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 149BC; *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1256B, 1260C.

²³¹ *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 149 (§57); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 76C, 149B; *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 149C, 261SA; *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1260C; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 920C.

²³² In the *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 120:16-17 (§25), Constantine V and Patriarch Constantine are compared to Iannes and Iambres. John the Grammarian and Anthony of Sylaeum are compared to Iannes and Iambres in the *Canon in erectione SS. imaginum*, PG 99, 1769B. The iconoclasts in general are compared to Iannes and Iambres in: Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 552C, 573CD; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 587 (epistle 419:41-42); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 81BC.

²³³ Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 270 (epistle 151:45); *Canon in erectione SS. imaginum*, PG 99, 1769B; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 798:19; *Vita Ignatii*, PG 105, 500C; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 901C. See also p. 51, n. 95 above. Similar expressions are also found in earlier patristic texts. For example, Gregory Nazianzenus, *Apologetica, de sacerdotio*, PG 35, 449B, mentions Iannes as type of a heretic who goes astray through vainglory. Andrew of Crete, in his *Magnus canon*, PG 97, 1356B, uses Iannes and Iambres as an allegory for the sins and temptations that keep the soul in slavery.

inspired by a demon, and on folio 51v (fig. 2), where he is being trampled by Patriarch Nikephoros. In this case John appears again as a demonic sorcerer, with the same prickly hair that characterize him in his other depictions (folios 67r, 23v, figs 1, 20); the inscription calls him “second Simon and Iannes” (both of whom were also sorcerers). This leading iconoclast is inscribed with the same nickname also on folio 165r of the Pantokrator Psalter (fig. 19), where he appears once more with the prickly hair of a demonic, discussing with David over the nature of idols, in relation to Psalm 113:12-16.²³⁴

If we accept that viewers of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalter would pick up these typological clues (of John-Iannes) for conflating iconoclasts with the Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and iconophiles with the Israelites whose exodus liberated them from slavery, we need to ask how many more of the images may have been seen in this light. The text below will not exhaust this subject but merely give examples of the possibilities a typological reading opens up for the understanding of ninth-century marginal psalter illustration. The scenes chosen for analysis as two of the most characteristic such cases are those of the drowned Pharaoh (Psalm 73) and the dance of Miriam (first Ode of Moses).

Psalm 73: The drowned Pharaoh

(Chludov Psalter, folio 72v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 98v)

Psalm 73:14, “Thou didst break to pieces the heads of the dragon; thou didst give him for meat to the Ethiopian nations” is illustrated with a picture of the Pharaoh drowned in the waters of the Red Sea on folio 72v of the Chludov and folio 98v of the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 66, 69). This scene is most likely a ninth-century addition to the tradition of psalter illustration. The relevant miniature on folio 120r of the Bristol Psalter shows a dead serpent being pecked by a crow and approached by another, in the waters of a river flowing from a rock.²³⁵ In this composition the “dragon” of the text is rendered literally, as a big snake, while the “Ethiopians” are transformed into black birds, so that they can fit logically into the composition. Psalm 73:13-14 is illustrated literally also on folio 42r of the Utrecht Psalter (snakes in a stream and on

²³⁴ These three miniatures are discussed by Corrigan (1992), 28, 33-35.

²³⁵ Dufrenne (1966), 61, pl. 54.

the shore where men are cutting them up),²³⁶ and on folio 57r of the Stuttgart Psalter (a dragon pierced by a spear held by a hand coming out from the sky, two dragon heads floating against the background).²³⁷

In the miniatures of the Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters (figs 66, 69), two crows are shown pecking the corpse of a man lying besides the waters of what must be the Red Sea, since he can be confidently identified with the drowned Pharaoh. This is the interpretation of Psalm 73:14 in psalm commentaries, in accordance with Psalm 73:15 which mention miracles performed on behalf of the Israelites after the crossing of the Red Sea.²³⁸ The inscription in the Chludov Psalter (only partially visible) also mentions the Pharaoh (*TON ΦΑΡΑΩ ΤΟΥΤ' ΕΣΤΙΝ ΑΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΥΑΑΤΟC*). This inscription is near to the drowned ruler of Egypt and below the Baptism scene which appears between the bleeding corpses of two serpents and a man. This composition, which appears also in the Pantokrator Psalter, illustrates Psalm 73:13 "Thou didst establish the sea, in thy might, thou didst break to pieces the heads of the dragons in the water." The relevant psalm commentaries here are those of Theodoret and Hesychios, who saw in the text a reference to Christ's Baptism.²³⁹

The visual connection set out in both psalters between the drowning of the Pharaoh in the Red Sea and Christ's Baptism is paralleled in several Early Christian and Byzantine texts, which interpret the defeat of the Pharaoh as a type of the defeat of the devil in the New Testament event and in the Christian sacrament of baptism.²⁴⁰ Aside from Christological typology, there is also a tropological dimension to the drowning of the Pharaoh, relevant to the life of every Christian. This is evident not only in the exegetical tradition with respect to *Exodus*, which sees the destruction of the Egyptian ruler and his army as synonymous with the defeat of the devil and his demons, or of temptations, sin, heresy and any other adversities that persecute the

²³⁶ De Wald (1930), 34, plate LXVIII.

²³⁷ De Wald (1930a), 67. The literal miniature of the Bristol Psalter, close to the Utrecht and the Stuttgart Psalter, reflects according to Dufrenne (1964), 161, and Corrigan (1992), 11, the pre-iconoclastic tradition of Byzantine Psalter illustration – which was enriched by the more interpretative approach of the marginal psalters in the ninth-century.

²³⁸ Eusebios, *PG* 23, 861-865 relates Psalm 73:2-18 to *Exodus*. Theodoret, *PG* 80, 1460C-1461A mentions the crossing of the Red Sea and the drowning of the Pharaoh in relation to Psalm 73:13-14.

²³⁹ Theodoret, *In psalmos*, *PG* 80, 1464A; Hesychios, *In psalmos*, *PG* 93, 1241D-1244A.

²⁴⁰ Danielou (1960a), 175-201. For a few examples of patristic references see Epiphanius of Cyprus, *In sanctam Christi resurrectionem*, *PG* 43, 468C-469C; Gregory of Nyssa, *De vita Moysis*, *PG* 44, 364AB, ed. and trans. in French Danielou (1955), 67-68; Patriarch Photios, *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI, 56 (question 265). See also Provatakis (1980), 174-76.

believers in Christ;²⁴¹ it is also explicitly stated in various commentaries on Psalm 77:13-14. We find in Eusebios that the sea in which the dragon-Pharaoh is drowned is viewed tropologically as the domain of evil powers, while the Ethiopians eating the dead dragon are those who have a dark soul –and thus feed upon unclean spiritual nourishment.²⁴² Theodoret correlates the drowned Pharaoh with the devil, and claims that, as the Egyptians were overwhelmed in the waters of the Red Sea and thus became an easy prey for the Ethiopians, so “our adversaries, after the holy font (of baptism), became easy to defeat by those who previously had a dark soul”, i.e. by those who prior to their Christian initiation had an impious and sinful heart.²⁴³ Didymos writing about Psalm 73:13-14 interprets the sea and waters as a reference to the temptations of an unstable life, and the destroyed dragons as an allusion to iniquitous masters and false beliefs (the latter being a synonym for heresy).²⁴⁴

Even more relevant to the present argument is the frequent association of heresy and heretics with poisonous serpents, sometimes specifically “dragons”, in various Early Christian and Byzantine texts.²⁴⁵ The most characteristic case is the treatise by Epiphanius of Cyprus against all heresies known until his time. Popular among (at least) the high clergy in Byzantium,²⁴⁶ this text was entitled by its author *Panarion*, meaning a medical box containing antidotes to the poisonous bites of heresies,²⁴⁷ almost all of which Epiphanius compares to dangerous serpents.²⁴⁸ In

²⁴¹ See pp. 80-81 above.

²⁴² In *psalmos*, PG 23, 861-865. Eusebios uses the word “τροπικῶς” (tropically) to name the typological interpretation that we call tropological.

²⁴³ In *psalmos*, PG 80, 1460C-1464A.

²⁴⁴ In *psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 109-10 (§774).

²⁴⁵ For example, snakes or poison (of serpents) as references to heresy are found in: Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* II, 932C; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 633C, 1004D, 1020B, 1029C, 1249C, *Mansi* V, 353B; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VII, 841B; Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 513B; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 636A; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 95 (VI.1:25-26), 99 (VI.1:122-26); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 538:10, 565:11-12; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 43, 47 (epistle 2:109/210), III, 77 (284:2565-66/2571). Specific references to heretic “dragons” in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1337E, 1340A, 1464B, *Mansi* V, 408E; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 93 (VI.1:5-6), 303 (XXII.4:73-76). See also the figurative use of serpents in the writings of Niketas Choniates, twelfth-century state-man, historian and theologian, Kazhdan – Franklin (1984), 267.

²⁴⁶ This is attested, for example, by its frequent citations in Patriarch Nikephoros’ *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 367-68 (index).

²⁴⁷ PG 41, 157CD, 177C, 201C, 360A; PG 42, 833A.

²⁴⁸ Notwithstanding its length, the following list of such references is not exhaustive: PG 41, 268D, 296A, 405B, 449D-452A, 473A, 485CD, 544A-C, 545A, 548C, 553D, 625CD, 632D, 640D-641A, 653C, 657A, 677AB, 689D-692A, 817B, 888CD, 889C, 892A, 988D-989A, 1037C, 1061C, 1065B, 1068D, 1185C, 1197C-1200A; PG 42, 28CD, 172C, 177AB, 201C, 213A, 320A, 380D, 473B, 545B, 705C, 740B, 756A, 820C.

certain cases he calls the heretics “dragons”,²⁴⁹ sometimes with specific mention of Psalm 73:13-14 to describe their defeat through God’s intervention.²⁵⁰ The psalm is quoted with the same meaning also in the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council.²⁵¹

Even more significant is the fact that iconophile texts compare the opponents of icons to poisonous serpents,²⁵² while the iconoclast emperors, as well as being referred to as “second Pharaohs”, are also called “dragons”; so appear Constantine V in the *Life of Stephen the Younger*,²⁵³ and Leo V in the epistles of Theodore the Studite.²⁵⁴ Iconoclasm itself is considered the work of “the great dragon”, Satan himself.²⁵⁵ Another connection between the iconoclasts and “dragons” is, on the one hand, the biblical and patristic use of this serpent as a synonym for the devil²⁵⁶ and, on the other, the claim of the iconophiles that their opponents are inspired or manipulated by the true instigators of all heresies and iconoclasm, the lord of the demons and his evil servants²⁵⁷ – a type of whom was also the Pharaoh and his

²⁴⁹ PG 41, 540D, 988C.

²⁵⁰ PG 41, 357C; PG 42, 172AB, 333A/D.

²⁵¹ Mansi IV, 1340B.

²⁵² Iconoclasts in general: Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 335 (epistle 212:21-22), 563 (406:21); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 156:78, 183:835-36; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 176:26-178:1 (§78); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1989), 77 (§8:9-11); *Vita Mehtodii*, PG 100, 1249C, 1256D; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 885D. George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 738:5 (Leo III and his Jewish instigators), 750:17-18 (Constantine V). Leo V: *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 78 (§16:1), 85 (§20:6); *Vita Ignatii*, PG 105, 492D; *Life of Nikephoros of Sevaze*, ed. Halkin (1953), 23 (§5). Emperor Theophilos: *Vita Mehtodii*, PG 100, 1249D, 1252B.

²⁵³ Ed. Auzépy (1997), 125:15 (§28), 154:21 (§55), 155:6/10 (§55), 165:1-4 (§63), 166:28 (§65), 173:10 (§74). The words “φερόννυμος δράκων” in paragraphs 55 and 63 suggest that Constantine V was regularly called “dragon” by his opponents (Auzépy [1997], 252, n. 352).

²⁵⁴ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 583 (epistle 417:10-11/22), 586 (419:13), 612 (435:30), 673 (469:33).

²⁵⁵ Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 544AB; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 347 (epistle 221:151-57); see also 468 (327:7-9), 558 (402:9-12). Germanos of Constantinople, *De haeresibus et synodis*, PG 98, 40B-41A, writes that the “dragon” inspires all the heresies against the Church.

²⁵⁶ As is observed, for example, by Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), VIII, 155 (no. 277). See also Lampe (1961), 386, “δράκων” 2.a;b;d;e, 4.

²⁵⁷ Examples in: John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 69 (II.2, III.1), 71 (II.4, III.1-2), 72-73 (II.6, III.3), 124 (III.13); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XIII*, 60D-61B, 205AB, 225E; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 400A, 493B, 513C, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 560BC, 573BC, 580B, 601B-604A, 605B, 621AB, 629D-632A, 641B, 645A, 704B, 716B, 745A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 12 (§6:58-59), 13 (§7:26-27), 20 (§10:48-49), 42 (§19:52-55), 196 (§111:51-70), 198 (§112:21-22); *Life of Patriarch Germanos*, ed. Lamza (1975), 218:255-56; *Life of Empress Eirene*, ed. Halkin (1988), 15 (§7); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 77C; *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 74 (§11:10), 75 (§13:1-10, 14:8), 79 (§18:13), 84 (§18:164-83); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Gouillard (1987), 75:37, 79:40; ; *Life of Nikephoros of Sevaze*, ed. Halkin (1953), 23-24 (§5). It is commonplace in Christian texts to consider the devil and his demons instigators of all heresies. Some examples: Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, *Mansi II*, 641C, 646A, 653C, 661AB, 725AB, 792D, 793C, 797C, 828C/E, 889B, 921A,

army.²⁵⁸ Thus the depiction of the drowned ruler of Egypt and of the bleeding “dragons” in relation to Psalm 73:13-14 in both the Chludov and the Pantokrator psalters, most probably conveyed a double message to the audience of ninth-century post-iconoclast Byzantium. Apart from illustrating the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea and of the devil in the waters of Christ’s Baptism, it alluded to the defeat of iconoclasts and their leaders, those “dragon”-like, devil-inspired “second Pharaohs” who were drowned during the Exodus of the New Israel from the land of heresy.

In the Chludov and the Pantokrator psalters such typological allusions of the dead Pharaoh and bleeding “dragons” to the defeat of iconoclasm are significantly enhanced by the miniatures illustrating Psalm 73:12-13. In both manuscripts, verse 12 has a miniature of Christ’s Crucifixion,²⁵⁹ and verse 13 a miniature of his Baptism (Pantokrator Psalter, folios 98r-v, figs 68-69; Chludov Psalter, folio 72v, fig. 66). Most probably they are ninth-century additions to the tradition of Psalter illustration, given that they are not found in the Utrecht, the Stuttgart, or Bristol Psalters. The two miniatures show Christ baptized and crucified in his human nature, but his divinity is also manifested through the dove of the Holy Ghost above the Jordan river (in both psalters), and by the supernatural phenomena involving the sun and the moon over Golgotha (Chludov Psalter only).²⁶⁰ In this way the miniatures affirm the truth of the Incarnation and its celebration in holy images. On the one hand they demonstrate the validity of the iconophile claim that Christ’s depiction in images is based on his Incarnation and, on the other hand, the error inherent in the iconoclast refusal to represent Christ which meant a denial of his human nature. By manifesting the invisible divinity of Christ through signs, these two miniatures give proof of Christ’s unconfused and undivided two natures and refute the iconoclast accusation that icons do not respect this basic dogma of Orthodoxy.²⁶¹ It follows that the three miniatures illustrating Psalm 73:12-14 should be read as a unified argument against iconoclasm:

929D; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 629B, 1044A, 1097B, 1117C, 1337E; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VI, 620AB668BC, 673D, *Mansi* VII, 108D, 456C, 460D, 513BC, 516C; Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 405D, 413A, 513B, 585B, 588C, 636D; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 629E, 636A, 660DE, 697CD, 728D, 732DE, 736C; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 368A, 545D, 673D, 857A, 1065C.

²⁵⁸ For some more patristic references to the Pharaoh as type of the devil (besides the ones in notes 240-41 above) see Lampe (1961), 1471, “Φαραώ”, 4.

²⁵⁹ Discussed by Corrigan (1992), 83, 85.

²⁶⁰ Discussed by Corrigan (1992), 85-87.

²⁶¹ See pp. 121-123 below.

together, the Crucifixion, the Baptism and the Pharaoh's drowning add up to a powerful anti-iconoclast image of Christological and typological content.

The point is less well made in the Pantokrator Psalter, because there the Crucifixion is on the previous folio and separated from the other miniatures. The better compositional solution of the Chludov Psalter means that the Christological scenes frame the drowned Pharaoh. Close to the bleeding "dragons" besides the waters of Baptism, the ruler of Egypt – type of the devil, and of impious men and iconoclast emperors – lies dead below Golgotha and the Cross of the Crucifixion. It is as if the shaft of the Cross on which the Incarnation of the Logos was triumphantly proven, has caused the death of the devil-Pharaoh and the iniquitous ideas for which he stands. The Cross is the victorious weapon with which Christ triumphs over the devil and death – a commonplace in patristic literature, rarely visualized in art, but shown on a tenth-century ivory plaque with the Crucifixion in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (17.190.44), representing Hades transfixed by the vertical shaft of the Cross (fig. 67).²⁶² Certain texts even compare the defeat of heretics with the killing of a serpent, or even a "dragon", by "the wood of life" on which the Lord was crucified. Such expressions are frequently found, for example, in the *Panarion* by Epiphanius of Cyprus.²⁶³

The composition of this page (folio 72v) in the Chludov Psalter was apparently carefully contrived, for the order of miniatures is out of phase with the text: the Crucifixion illustrates verse 12 and the Baptism verse 13; but the Pharaoh illustrates verse 14 and has been placed ahead of the Baptism to give the triangular meaning in this page. On folios 98r-v of the Pantokrator Psalter the scenes are set out in the conventional and more prosaic order. The artist of the Chludov Psalter also had the space to follow this order (he could have painted the Crucifixion higher up on the page to make space for the Baptism right below), but deliberately chose to set out the images differently in order to create a more sophisticated visual commentary on the psalm.

²⁶² Frazer (1974); *The Glory of Byzantium* (1997), 151-52, cat. no. 97. See also Walter (1997); Provatakis (1980), 163-64, esp. n. 120; Lampe (1961), 1253, "σταυρός", C.b; 1411-12, "τρόπαιον", 1-2. Examples of relevant references in: Andrew of Crete, *In exaltationem crucis*, PG 97, 1020D, 1025C; John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 188 (IV.10:42).

²⁶³ PG 41, 361C, 361D-364B, 377C (specific reference to the "dragon" killed by the Cross), 388CD, 993D, 1049D; PG 42, 184AB.

The first Ode of Moses: The crossing of the Red Sea and the dance of Miriam
(Chludov Psalter, folio 148v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 206r)

The crossing of the Red Sea is another scene with typological allusions to iconophile victory. It appears twice in the Chludov Psalter (folios 108r, 148v) and twice in the Pantokrator Psalter (folios 103v, 206r), but it is probable that initially both manuscripts contained a third depiction of the event. Both psalters preserve a scene of the crossing as illustration to the first Ode of Moses (figs 73-74). The Chludov Psalter contains a second such miniature for Psalm 105:9-11 (fig. 70), but lacks the folio that included Psalm 77:13, which is illustrated with the crossing in the Pantokrator Psalter (fig. 71). The Pantokrator Psalter in turn lacks Psalm 105:9-11. Only one representation of the crossing survives on folio 16r of the Paris marginal Psalter, in relation to Psalm 105:9-11 (fig. 72).²⁶⁴

Since the Bristol Psalter contains the crossing of the Red Sea or a related episode as illustrations of Psalms 77 and 105,²⁶⁵ we may infer that the picture was part of the tradition of psalter illustration before the ninth century. However, as mentioned already, such images may have had a second layer of meaning for iconophile viewers. In the polemically anti-iconoclastic contexts of the ninth-century marginal psalters the scene may have been read as a reference to the salvation of the Church from iconoclasm. Such a reading can be applied more confidently to the illustration of the first Ode of Moses, which combines the crossing of the Red Sea with the dance of Miriam, and is examined in greater detail below.

Miriam, sister of Moses, dancing ahead of the Israelites who have just crossed the Red Sea, is shown on folio 148v of the Chludov and folio 206r of the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 73-74). Both miniatures illustrate the first Ode of Moses, sung by him and the “sons of Israel” to thank God for their salvation (*Exodus* 15:1-19). In the Chludov Psalter, the Israelites appear as a group of men and women led by the prophet (inscribed *MOYCHC*), as the waters are drawn back behind them, burying the Pharaoh in his wet grave (the outline of at least one human figure is faintly visible below the blue waters). In front of them Miriam (identified by the inscription *H*

²⁶⁴ Chludov Psalter (Ščepkina [1977]), Corrigan (1992), 143 for the missing folio; Pantokrator Psalter, Dufrenne (1966), 29, 36, pls. 14, 29; Paris marginal Psalter, Dufrenne (1966), 45, pl. 40.

²⁶⁵ Folios 127r, 178r, Dufrenne (1966), 61, 64, pls. 55, 58. In the second case the scene depicted is the drowning of the Egyptian army illustrating Psalm 105:11 (as in the Utrecht Psalter, folio 61v, De Wald [1930], 48, pl. XCVII), and not the crossing of the Red Sea next to verse 9 as in the Chludov Psalter.

ΑΔΕΛΦΗ ΜΩΥΣΕΩΣ Η ΜΑΡΙΑΜ) is dancing and playing her cymbals, as in *Exodus* 15:20-21. In the Pantokrator Psalter the composition is more laconic: in the centre a group of men, one of them raising his hands in supplication as they sing the ode, look towards the dancing Miriam (ΜΑΡΙΑΜ), while their leader Moses (ΜΩΥΣΗΣ) stands behind them carrying his rod. The Red Sea is not depicted, as the Israelites have already left it behind them.

Miriam dancing in front of her people differentiates these two miniatures, and especially the composition in the Chludov Psalter, not only from the other representation of the crossing of the Red Sea included in the two psalters, but also from most depictions of the event in Byzantine art in general. Usually Miriam is shown as dancing with other Israelite women in self-contained compositions (which do not include the Red Sea crossing) as an illustration to *Exodus* 15:1-19 in books of the psalter and odes, or *Exodus* 15:19-20 in octateuchs (Table 4, figs 78-83). The only other significant case known to me where the prophetess is depicted dancing alone in front of the Israelites after the crossing of the Red Sea is folio 264v of cod. Paris. gr. 510 (fig. 75), where it forms part of the illustration of the sermon by Gregory Nazianzenus *In sanctum baptismum*.²⁶⁶ On folio 192v of the Theodore Psalter (fig. 77),²⁶⁷ and folio 249v of the Barberini Psalter,²⁶⁸ indirect copies of the Chludov Psalter, Miriam appears without other women in front of the Israelites that have just crossed the Red Sea, playing her timbrel but not dancing.²⁶⁹ Yet another iconographic solution is followed on folio 365v of the psalter in the Public Library of New York, Spencer Collection, cod. gr. 1 of the early 13th century (fig. 76): ahead of the Israelites crossing the Red Sea walks a woman holding cymbals, identifiable with Miriam. Contrary to the ninth-century marginal-psalter miniatures, however, Miriam is not dancing, nor is she shown apart from the other Israelites. Next to her a young man is holding a cylindrical drum to accompany her cymbals.²⁷⁰ In other words, the combination of the crossing of the Red Sea with Miriam dancing alone appears to have been a special iconographic innovation of the three ninth-century manuscripts

²⁶⁶ Omont (1929), 24-25, pl. XLII; Brubaker (1999), 217-18, 221, fig. 28.

²⁶⁷ Der Nersessian (1970), 59, fig. 302.

²⁶⁸ Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 145.

²⁶⁹ A composition similar to that in the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters appears on folios 205v-206r of the Kiev Psalter, which had as its prototype a codex similar to the Theodore Psalter (Vzdornov [1978], 155). The only basic difference is that in the miniature of the Slavonic manuscript Miriam is dancing among three other women playing musical instruments.

²⁷⁰ Cutler (1984), 57, fig. 212.

(Chludov Psalter, Pantokrator Psalter, cod. Paris. gr. 510). What these manuscripts have in common is a positive and sophisticated espousal of Orthodox, and specifically iconophile, thinking. Does this help to explain the meaning of Miriam's dance in this representation?

According to *Exodus* 15:20-21, after Moses and the "sons of Israel" chanted an ode to the Lord in thanksgiving for their safe passage through the Red Sea and the destruction of the Egyptians, Miriam took her timbrel and led a chorus of women dancing and chanting the first verse of the ode, so turning their celebration of salvation into a festive event. Since Byzantine psalters with a collection of odes include only *Exodus* 15:1-19 and omit the passage that makes reference to Miriam, the usual illustration for the first Ode of Moses, marking also the beginning of the whole ode collection, is the crossing of the Red Sea (Table 3). However, since the *Exodus* narrative implies that the women led by Miriam sung the whole ode for a second time, dancing and playing their timbrels, a picture of this sometimes does appear before the first Ode of Moses (either by itself or with a depiction of the crossing, usually on the facing or previous folio – Table 4). In these illustrations the dancing women range from two to fourteen, sometimes with an inscription identifying Miriam among them.²⁷¹ The prophetess never appears dancing alone, nor is the dancing scene ever incorporated into that of the crossing of the Red Sea. Even when the two episodes are shown on the same folio, they are divided by a frame (Table 4, number 8, fig. 83). The only exception to this rule is the miniature on folio 243v of the Hamilton Psalter (fig. 84): at the top of the folio the Red Sea appears behind a group of Israelites led by Moses, while in the foreground six women are dancing in a circle, accompanied by a musician on the left and some children playing and wrestling at the bottom of the page.²⁷²

It is therefore exceptional that the miniatures of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalter and cod. Paris. gr. 510 show Miriam dancing alone. She has become a conspicuous element in the composition, with her arms raised above her head, her long hair and her brightly coloured dress swirling around her to suggest her spinning movement, while an inscription clearly identifies her as the sister of

²⁷¹ Table 3, numbers 1, 10, 13, 14. The octateuch miniatures mentioned under numbers 18 and 19 have the inscription "Miriam with the singing women"; the name appears right above the figure holding a timbrel, who can be identified with Miriam).

²⁷² Havice (1978), 464.

Moses.²⁷³ We have already seen that the crossing of the Red Sea was interpreted by the Church Fathers as a type of the salvation of the new chosen people of God, the Christians, by the new Moses, Christ, through his victory over the devil as a result of the Incarnation, with particular reference to the mystery of baptism.²⁷⁴ Alternatively, the Old Testament episode was seen as an image of the deliverance of the Orthodox Church from the second Pharaoh and his army, the advocates of heresy and their followers. The question is whether the dance of Miriam was interpreted in the same light, as type of the Church celebrating for the deliverance of her people through the Incarnation of Christ and the mystery of baptism, or through the victory of Orthodoxy over heresy. We shall have to look at some relevant texts to resolve this question.

The miniature on folio 264v of cod. Paris. gr. 510 (fig. 75) illustrates the homily of Gregory the theologian *In sanctum baptisma* with scenes functioning either as types of the Christian mystery of initiation (the ascension of Elijah, the crossing of the Red Sea) or referring to the illumination of the initiated through the light of the Holy Ghost (Moses and the Burning Bush, the conversion of Saul).²⁷⁵ The crossing of the Red Sea takes up the largest section of the illuminated folio, not only because of the many figures involved in the scene, but also because this episode was in Byzantine exegesis one of the most prominent biblical types of the mystery of baptism. Brubaker has suggested that the prominence of this scene may also be related to its allusions to the imperial Byzantine ideal, in reflection of the purpose of the whole codex as present to Emperor Basil I by Patriarch Photios (between 879-82).²⁷⁶ She points out that one significance of the rod of Moses in this miniature is that it was an actual relic kept in the palace of Constantinople and brought out for certain imperial processions.²⁷⁷

In this context it may be added that an obvious reason for the dance of Miriam would be to indicate imperial triumph, for dancers certainly participated in triumphant celebrations of the emperor's victory and glory (as is shown, for instance, on the base

²⁷³ In addition, a veil is floating around Miriam's head in cod. Paris. gr. 510 (fig. 75).

²⁷⁴ Mentioned also by Brubaker (1999), 218, in relation to the crossing of the Red Sea in cod. Paris. gr. 510.

²⁷⁵ Brubaker (1999), 217-221.

²⁷⁶ Brubaker (1999), 221, 343. She mentions in particular that "The equation between Moses, who led his people to freedom across the Red Sea, and Constantine, who led his people to Christianity across the Tiber on the Milvian bridge, was an old and familiar one."

²⁷⁷ Brubaker (1999), 221, n. 100 for further bibliography. See also p. 116 below. The use of the rod of Moses in imperial processions is recorded by Constantine Porphyrogenetos in *De cerimoniis*, ed. Vogt (1935), I, 4:13, 7:23, (commented in II, 22, as brought in Constantinople in the time of Constantine I).

of the obelisk of Theodosius in the hippodrome of Constantinople).²⁷⁸ These dancers could fittingly be related to biblical figures, like the daughters of Israel who celebrated David's victory over Goliath with singing and dancing (*I.Kings* 18:6-7), or the women that accompanied Miriam in her celebration of the safe passage of the Jews through the Red Sea. It has been suggested, for example, that the dancers depicted on the "crown of Constantine XI Monomachos" allude to such biblical figures in relation to the imagery of imperial triumph in the iconography of the crown as a whole (fig. 85).²⁷⁹ It has been also proposed that the miniature with the fourteen dancers illustrating the first ode of Moses in the eleventh-century psalter cod. Vat. gr. 752 (fig. 79) makes an obvious reference to contemporary Constantinopolitan life (through the type of round dance shown, the women's attire and the instruments played), and "clearly it has a celebratory purpose, possibly referring to a specific victory that now escapes us".²⁸⁰ Closer in date to cod. Paris. gr. 510 is the ivory casket of the Palazzo Venezia in Rome (second half of the ninth century, or early tenth, fig. 86). The scene of the daughters of Israel dancing to celebrate David's victory over Goliath are among the episodes from David's life adorning this object, and they are all thought to construct a visual panegyric in favour of the Byzantine emperor shown on the lid, identified either with Basil I or his son Leo VI.²⁸¹ Likewise, if the crossing of the Red Sea on folio 264v of cod. Paris. gr. 510 bears imperial allusions, ultimately suggesting a comparison between Moses and Basil I who leads his chosen people to the promised land, Miriam could also allude to the celebration of imperial triumph.

This interpretation may, however, underestimate the baptismal symbolism of the whole page. In his *Oratio consolatoria ad aegrotum*, Proclus of Constantinople identifies Miriam with the Christian Church which, after being freed from the spiritual Pharaoh and his army through the mystery of baptism, takes her timbrel of thanksgiving and chants "Let us sing to the Lord, for he has been very greatly glorified" (*Exodus* 15:21), adding to her song a praise to the Incarnation.²⁸² Similarly, in his *Oratio de recens baptizatis et in resurrectionem*, Amphilochios of Iconium says

²⁷⁸ Webb (1997), 129-29. Records of the dancing of soldiers and citizens to celebrate imperial victory is also mentioned by Koukoules (1952), 219, n. 2.

²⁷⁹ *The Glory of Byzantium* (1997), 210, n. 16, cat. no. 145; *Byzantium* (2002), 80, cat. no. 14. The crown is dated 1042-1050 by those who consider it authentic. For a contestation of its authenticity see Oikonomides (1994).

²⁸⁰ Ioli Kalavrezou in: *The Glory of Byzantium* (1997), 207, cat. no. 142.

²⁸¹ Maguire (1988), 89-93, esp. 91, fig. 5 (he relates the casket to Basil I); Cutler – Oikonomides (1988), esp. 84-85 (they relate the casket to Leo VI). See also Brubaker (1999), 185-86.

²⁸² Ed. Rudberg (1959), 320-21; also in *PG* 31, 1721B, under the name of Basil the Great.

that the ode sung by Miriam after the Pharaoh and his army drowned in the Red Sea is more fitting for Christians celebrating the defeat of the devil and his demons in the waters of baptism.²⁸³ Photios in his *Bibliotheca* makes reference to works by both Proclus and Amphilochios, although not those mentioned above.²⁸⁴ It is possible therefore that he was familiar with the passages that relate the dancing Miriam to the Church celebrating baptism. Alternatively, he could have known other similar texts, like that from a homily *In Martham, Mariam et Lazarum* (spuriously attributed to John Chrysostom), in which the author prompts Christians to thank Christ by imitating Miriam, although they should chant with a stronger voice, since the devil that drowned in the waters (of baptism) is a much greater enemy than the Pharaoh.²⁸⁵

The use of Miriam as a type of the Church or the Christian soul celebrating a joyous event (not necessarily baptism) appears in Early Christian and Byzantine literature, and Photios must have been familiar with this tradition. For example, Epiphanius of Cyprus in his oration *In sanctam Christi resurrectionem* compares the Exodus from Egypt with the salvation of humankind by Jesus, and Miriam's dance in gratitude for the liberation of the Israelites with the dance of the Church celebrating her deliverance on the anniversary of Christ's Resurrection.²⁸⁶ Similarly, Cyril of Alexandria, in his *Commentarius in Michaeam prophetam*, writes in relation to *Mich.* 6:3-4 that the dancing and chanting Miriam is a type of the Church glorifying God for saving her from her enemies.²⁸⁷ Origen in his commentary *In exodum, homilia VI de cantico quod cantant Moyses cum populo, et Maria cum mulieribus* writes that if a Christian sees the devil and the sin he inspires eliminated like the drowned Pharaoh, he can sing the ode of Moses, holding in his hand (like Miriam) a timbrel that symbolizes the mortification of the flesh (since this instrument is made of a dead animal's skin).²⁸⁸ Likewise, in his *Alia capita* Maximus the Confessor compares Miriam celebrating the defeat of the Egyptians with the soul that praises God for her victory over her passions.²⁸⁹

²⁸³ *Opera*, ed. Datema (1978), 157 (homily VII.3:52-63).

²⁸⁴ Ed. Henry (1959-77), IV, 148, 149, 170.

²⁸⁵ *PG* 61, 703.

²⁸⁶ *PG* 43, 468C-469C.

²⁸⁷ *PG* 71, 732AB.

²⁸⁸ *PG* 12, 331D-332A.

²⁸⁹ *PG* 90, 1444AB.

It is true of course that the Church Fathers strongly condemned women dancing in public or even at private events.²⁹⁰ But they made an exception for the case of Miriam's thanksgiving chant and dancing to the Lord, and for the dancing by the daughters of Israel to celebrate David's victory over Goliath, and do accept these biblical episodes as examples to be imitated by Christians in their glorification of God.²⁹¹ This approval is reflected in the depiction of Israelite women dancing in Byzantine manuscripts, in relation to either *Exodus* 15:20-21,²⁹² or *I.Kings* 18:6-7 (figs 78-84, 86-87).²⁹³ Also, in Byzantine literature the Church is often described as "dancing" when celebrating a feast or other important event, often without particular reference to Miriam,²⁹⁴ and similar expressions can be found in iconophile texts. In the 8th Act of the Seventh Ecumenical Council the Church is said to "dance" for the return of repentant heretics to Orthodoxy.²⁹⁵ In the *Vita* of Patriarch Nikephoros, the Church is "dancing with music" out of joy over this prominent iconophile entering into heaven with the Just.²⁹⁶ Specific reference is made to Miriam in the *Vita* of John of Damascus and in two homilies written by him. In his *Vita*, the Virgin appears in the dream of a monk who had forced the vow of silence on John when he was still a novice and punished him for composing a hymn. Mary rebukes the monk for having silenced a hymnographer like John, who "with his great work will surpass the ode of Moses and the dancing and chanting of Miriam."²⁹⁷ In his second homily on the Dormition of the Virgin, John himself prompts Christian souls to dance together with Miriam to celebrate the glorious event of the assumption of the Virgin.²⁹⁸ His third homily on the Dormition is equally relevant. It criticizes Nestorios for not accepting that Mary was the Mother of God, something proved decisively by her assumption, and goes on to compare the defeat of the Nestorians and their leader with the drowning of the Egyptians and their Pharaoh in the Red Sea. He says that Orthodox

²⁹⁰ See Koukoules (1952), 207-210, with patristic references. Also Webb (1977), especially 120-122, 130 with reference to Church councils, 131 ff.

²⁹¹ For example, Pseudo-Chrysostom *In media Pentecoste*, PG 61 739-40.

²⁹² Apart the illustrations of the first Ode of Moses in the psalters mentioned above, in four illustrated Octateuchs: Table 4, numbers 16-19, fig. 80.

²⁹³ For example, in the illustrated Book of Kings, cod. Vat. gr. 333, folio 24r (fig. 87), Lassus (1973), 53, fig. 44. Also on folio 5v of cod. Paris. gr. 139, Cutler (1984), 65, fig. 249. Included in the illustration of Psalm 151, a woman is dancing in front of David holding Goliath's head on a spear on folio 449r of the psalter cod. Vat. gr. 752 (De Wald [1942], 40-41, pl. LIII).

²⁹⁴ For example, Epiphanius of Cyprus, *In die festo palmarum*, PG 43, 428C, 432B; John Chrysostom (*spuria*), *In ramos palmarum*, PG 59, 706.

²⁹⁵ *Mansi* XIII, 455E.

²⁹⁶ PG 100, 152D-153A.

²⁹⁷ PG 94, 472C-473A.

²⁹⁸ PG 96, 744D.

Christians, saved from the sea of impiety, should sing the ode of *Exodus* to the Mother of God, while “Miriam, the Church, should pick up the timbrel and lead the chorus in the festive chanting.”²⁹⁹

On this basis I would argue that we can interpret the miniatures in the Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters as the Orthodox Church in the person of Miriam celebrating her salvation after the drowning of the second Pharaoh and his army representing the evil heresy of iconoclasm. The analogy works better in the Chludov Psalter, where the waters of the Red Sea closing over and drowning the Pharaoh behind the chosen people of God (an element omitted in the Pantokrator miniature) help to emphasize the event of the salvation, and where the group of Israelites consists of not only young men but also has women and elders to reflect the whole community of the Christian Church. Another point here is that in the Chludov Psalter, the crossing of the Red Sea and the dance of Miriam appear immediately after the miniatures of David killing the wild beasts and beheading Goliath (folios 147v and 149r), which I have elsewhere (pp. 54-57) interpreted as representing typological allusions to the triumph of Orthodoxy. This would mean that as the Byzantine viewers turned the pages of the Chludov Psalter they saw a cumulative set of references to the victory of the iconophiles and Orthodoxy over iconoclasm and heresy, something they could share with the dance of Miriam.

The aim of this analysis has been to deepen our understanding of the several layers of meaning with which psalter imagery might have been read in the ninth century. The next section will attempt to further develop this notion of typological “stratification” in the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters, by examining the pictorial representation of some other key events of Jewish history, with emphasis on the Chludov Psalter.

²⁹⁹ PG 96, 757A.

Psalm 105: Iconophile virtue against iconoclast iniquity in biblical guise
(Chludov Psalter, folios 109v-110r; Paris marginal Psalter, folios 17v-18r)

Folios 109v-110r of the Chludov Psalter illustrate Psalm 105:28-30, 37-38, and 40-41 with four Old Testament episodes in which Jewish iniquity receives God-sent punishment. On folio 109v (fig. 88) the Israelites are shown adoring the idol of Beelphegor, Phineas killing the Israelite Zambri and the Midianite woman Chasbi who induced him to idolatry, and Jews sacrificing their children to demons. This final episode is continued at the top of folio 110r (fig. 89), with the slaughter and capture of the Israelites by enemies on horseback shown below. There is some difficulty about the precise identification of this final scene. It should be noted in this respect that the horsemen are dressed exactly like the Babylonians who drag the Jews into captivity on folio 78v (fig. 99). Even though Psalm 105:40-41 does not specifically mention this event, we can identify the scene here as the captivity of the Jews to the Babylonians, because the equivalent illustration on folio 18r of the Paris marginal Psalter (fig. 91), and folio 180v of the Bristol Psalter that show the Israelites being dragged along by men on horseback bear the captions of “captivity” and “Hebrew captives” respectively.³⁰⁰ The Paris marginal Psalter includes a set of miniatures similar to those of the Chludov Psalter for Psalm 105:28-41, divided into two pairs on facing folios: folio 17v (fig. 90) contains the adoration of Beelphegor and the punishment of Zambri and Chasbi by Phineas, while on folio 18r (fig. 91) the Jews are shown sacrificing their children and being dragged into captivity. The Pantokrator Psalter today has only the two scenes with Beelphegor and Phineas, depicted on folios 153r, and 153v (fig. 92) respectively, but it is probable that originally it also included the other two on its folio 154, which is now severely damaged.³⁰¹

The design of the miniatures in the Chludov and the Paris marginal psalters stresses the theme of the punishment of iniquity in keeping with the psalm text. The pairing of the miniatures makes the point that adoration of idols results in the killing of impious idolaters by Phineas, and that sacrificing their children to demons brings about the defeat and captivity of the Jews. Moreover, certain iconographic and compositional elements have been employed in order to emphasize the relation between iniquity and punishment. In both manuscripts, Beelphegor stands raised on a

³⁰⁰ Dufrenne (1966), 45, 65.

³⁰¹ Dufrenne (1966), 34.

column and holds a long sceptre in his right hand, while the Israelites are kneeling in front of him. Phineas is likewise depicted standing high on a rock, killing the impious Zambri and Chasbi (who are shown inside a pit on the ground below him) with a long lance held in his right hand (figs 88, 90). It is worth noting that in the Paris marginal Psalter this spear is aligned on exactly the same angle as the sceptre of Beelphegor with only a minimal space between them, as if one is the continuation of the other (fig. 90). This visual effect underlines the logic of cause and effect, iniquity and punishment, emphasizing that since the Jews bowed before Beelphegor's sceptre, they must also submit to Phineas' lance.

Another compositional device relates the scene of the Jews sacrificing their children to that of their captivity. In the Chludov Psalter, the last of the horsemen in the Babylonian cavalry looks up and points with his left hand towards the scene of the dreadful slaughter, as if to indicate that God permitted the defeat and slavery of the Israelites as a punishment for their unspeakable iniquity (fig. 89). Similarly, in the Paris marginal Psalter all the Babylonians who are pulling the bound Jews in bondage behind them are emphatically looking up at the scene of the sacrifice, as if to show that even they are shocked by an iniquity that was repaid by God with the captivity of the perpetrators (fig. 91).

An indication of the possible typological iconophile connotation of these two pairs of miniatures is offered by the figure of Phineas. Since he does not appear in the illustration of Psalm 105 in the Bristol Psalter (although the adoration of Beelphegor, the sacrifice of the Israelites' children and the captivity are all included), it may be the case that Phineas was a ninth-century addition to the traditional imagery.³⁰² In the literary tradition of Byzantium, Phineas was typologically used to signify the advocates of Orthodoxy cleansing the Church from the impiety of heretics;³⁰³ the latter were induced to betray the one and only God through their attachment to false

³⁰² Corrigan (1992), 20, 36. In the Bristol Psalter the three scenes appear on folios 179v-180v, Dufrenne (1966), 64-65. The Stuttgart Psalter (folio 121v) includes an image of Phineas praying to God to cease the plague sent to the Jews for their idolatry; the Israelites sacrificing their children to demons are also depicted (folio 122r). See De Wald (1930a), 87-88.

³⁰³ For example: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1464BC (referring to Cyril of Alexandria); Acts of the Quinisext Council, *Mansi* XI, 933A, ed. and trans. Nedungatt – Featherstone (1995), 50:18-20 (Justinian II who summoned the council has surpassed Phineas). Gregory of Nyssa uses Phineas as a figure emblematic of the uprooting of carnal passions (*De vita Moysis*, ed. Danielou [1955], 127-28), or of sin through the spear of baptism (*In diem luminum*, ed. Heil *et alii* [1967], 240:2-6).

beliefs, likewise to Zambri, who refused the true Lord under the influence of the idolatrous Chasbi (*Numbers* 25:1-15).

In iconophile texts, great opponents of iconoclasm, such as Patriarchs Tarasios³⁰⁴ and Nikephoros,³⁰⁵ or Theodore the Studite³⁰⁶ and Nicholas the Studite,³⁰⁷ are compared to Phineas. In the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, and in the writings of Patriarch Nikephoros, iconophiles are said to be like Phineas and to pierce the impiety of iconoclasts with the “spear of the spirit”, defeating in one stroke “all those that are entangled with one another is this impiety”,³⁰⁸ discarding together the heretics of the first and the second Iconoclasm,³⁰⁹ and doing away with both the Manichean and Arian impiety of this heresy.³¹⁰ The emphasis of these passages to the defeat of “entangled” heretics and pairs of evils in one stroke creates a close analogy with the Old Testament event, where Phineas pierced the embraced idolatrous couple in one blow of his spear (*Numbers* 25:8). Patriarch Photios calls emperor Michael III “our Phineas” for summoning the anti-heretic council of 867, considering the emperor to be superior to his Old Testament model because he cleansed the empire of error and plague without bloodshed.³¹¹

The representation of Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi in the three ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters has been related by Corrigan to the intense anti-Jewish polemics of iconophile literature, where iconoclasm is considered a heresy instigated by Jews or by Jewish-minded (*ιουδαιοφρονες*) heretics, and many of the arguments in support of icons, especially those refuting accusations of idolatry, originate from the *Adversus Judaeos* literature of the past.³¹² The frequent reference to Phineas in iconophile sources would suggest that in the ninth-century marginal psalter the figure of this exemplar Old Testament priest, depicted in the act of

³⁰⁴ *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 91 (§17:10), 150 (§58:5-8)

³⁰⁵ *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 72AB, 149D.

³⁰⁶ *Ex Naucrati confessoris encyclica, de obitu S. Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 97D; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 892B. Theodore the Studite implicitly compares himself to Phineas when writing about his opposition to the second marriage of Constantine VI, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 138 (48:274).

³⁰⁷ *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 920C.

³⁰⁸ *Mansi* XIII, 205E, trans. Sahas (1986), 50; also mentioned by Corrigan (1992), 36. In the same council, *Mansi* XIII, 277A, it is said that the iconoclasts will be pierced and defeated by the “spear of the spirit”; the weapon is called “σειρομάστης” like Phineas’ spear in *Numbers* 25:8 (and like in the passage in *Mansi* XIII, 205E, where Phineas is specifically mentioned).

³⁰⁹ *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 81 (§36:78-84).

³¹⁰ *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 208A.

³¹¹ *Homilies*, ed. Laourdas (1959), 179:6-10 (homily XVIII); trans. Mango (1958), 313-14; also mentioned by Corrigan (1992), 36, n. 53.

³¹² Corrigan (1992), 36.

punishing impiety, may be also seen as a typological allusion to the defeat of iconoclasm.

An element that could be taken to corroborate this typological reading of the figure of Phineas is its peculiar iconography, which departs from the standards of Byzantine art as it is known to us from the Middle Byzantine illustrated copies of the octateuch. There the episode is shown in accordance with *Numbers* 25:7-8 (fig. 94). The iniquitous couple is depicted lying in bed in an amorous embrace, as Phineas approaches them on the same level and pierces them with his spear. He is dressed in the robes of a Jewish priest, since as the son of Eleazar and the grandson of Aaron he belonged to the lineage of high priests (*Numbers* 25:7/13).³¹³ In the ninth-century marginal psalters, on the contrary, Zambri and Chasbi are represented fallen on the ground, while Phineas stands high above them on a rock, dressed like a Byzantine general or even an emperor in military dress, a cuirass over a tunic, with chlamys, boots, spear and shield, and on his head a diadem with a central element (figs 88, 90, 92).³¹⁴ For example, Basil II on folio IIIr of cod. Marc. gr. Z 17, dated at the beginning of the eleventh century, is dressed in similar military uniform (fig. 93).³¹⁵ The emperor is standing with a lance in his right hand above his defeated foes fallen at his feet. (Compositionally this miniature recalls Phineas piercing Zambri and Chasbi in the ninth-century marginal psalters, although Basil is not attacking his foes, but holds the lance upwards.)

The depiction of Phineas raised above his victims not only creates a telling analogy with the figure of Beelphegor standing high above the iniquitous Jews, so that the relationship between impiety and punishment is underlined, it also emphasises the triumph over a defeated enemy, suggesting that a real battle against iniquity is won. (Phineas' military dress contributes to this impression). In the Chludov Psalter, where the miniature is better preserved and more legible, it is evident that the idolatrous couple, visible only in bust, is shown as if emerging from a hole on the ground, like a snake or other animal. This reminds us of the commonplace in Byzantine literature

³¹³ Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, cod. gr. 747, folio 178v (eleventh century); Topkapi Saryi Library, cod. G. I. 8, folio 373v (twelfth century); Smyrna Evangelical School Library (*olim*), cod. A. I, folio 174r (twelfth century); Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, cod. gr. 746, folio 359v (twelfth or thirteenth century); Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery, cod. 602, folio 186v (thirteenth century). See Weitzmann – Bernabò (1999), 210 figs 1013a-1017a. In the Chludov Psalter Aaron and Samuel on folio 98v (fig. 146), and Zacharias on folio 163v are shown in the dress of the Jewish high priest.

³¹⁴ For the military dress of the Byzantine emperor see Gioles (2002), 63, fig. 15.

³¹⁵ Cutler (1992a); Cutler (1984) 115-19.

assimilation of impious and heretic men to serpents and wild beasts, and enhances the polemical tone of the miniature. In fact, in the Theodore Psalter Phineas is indeed shown piercing not Zambri and Chasbi but an animal inside a cave (fig. 96) – while in the relevant miniature of the Barberini Psalter it is the iniquitous couple that is shown in the cave.³¹⁶

Phineas' warlike character is particularly emphasized in the ninth-century cod. Paris. gr. 923,³¹⁷ and the eleventh-century Barberini and Theodore Psalters, where he is represented not only in armour but also mounted on a horse when he attacks Zambri and Chasbi – or the beast that has taken their place in the latter codex – (figs 95-96). These pictures bring in mind representations of military saints on horseback, piercing a dragon or an idolatrous emperor. St Mercurios killing Julian the Apostate, and Constantine the Great defeating Maxentius, on folios 409 and 540r of the ninth-century cod. Paris. gr. 510,³¹⁸ share with cod. Paris. gr. 923 and the two eleventh-century psalters the horizontal compositional arrangement of the scene (fig. 97). Saints Theodore and George killing a serpent and an idolatrous emperor on two triptych leaves of the ninth to tenth century, now kept at the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai (fig. 98), resemble in their vertical compositional arrangement the scene of Phineas killing the idolaters in the ninth-century marginal psalters.³¹⁹ Despite their compositional and iconographic differences, all these depictions share the same basic idea of the virtuous fighter defeating embodiments of evil by piercing them with his spear, demonstrating not only his bravery and valour, but above all his faith in God and his adversity to iniquity.³²⁰

All the miniatures where Phineas appears in military dress, whether mounted or on foot as he kills Zambri and Chasbi, emphasize by their warlike aspect the intensity of the conflict between piety and impiety. Exactly this element of the compositions, which goes beyond the biblical narrative of the episode, suggests that a general typological reference to the confrontation between good and evil was probably intended. In the ninth-century marginal psalters such a typological

³¹⁶ Folio 144r, Der Nersessian (1970), 50, fig. 231; folio 183v, Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 127.

³¹⁷ Folio 274v, Weitzmann (1979), 60-61, fig. 78.

³¹⁸ Omont (1929), 29, 31 pls. LIV, LIX; Brubaker (1999), figs 40, 45; colour reproduction of folio 540r in *Byzantium* (2002), 20, fig. 2.

³¹⁹ Weitzmann (1976), 71-73, pl. XXVIII.

³²⁰ See Weitzmann (1979), 61, for an interpretation of the depiction of Phineas on horseback based on a Jewish legend where the priest compares himself to a horse willing to go to battle and serve his master.

interpretation of this figure as a reference to the triumph of Orthodoxy over heresy is analogous to the typological reading of David killing Goliath as an allusion to the victory of the iconophiles over iconoclasts (folio 148r of the Chludov Psalter, fig. 23). Both cases correspond not only to specific references of iconophile sources to David and Phineas as exemplary fighters against impiety and as types of the iconophile defenders of Orthodoxy; they are also compatible with the common description in the Byzantine literary tradition of the confrontation between good and evil, piety and iniquity, as a spiritual war, with vocabulary taken from the field of battle.³²¹

Acceptance of a typological reading of Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi conduces to acceptance of a compatible typological reading for the closely related miniature of the Jews adoring Beelphegor, and for the analogous pair of miniatures showing the Israelites sacrificing their children and being dragged into captivity. If the figure of Phineas stands for the victory of Orthodoxy over iconoclasm, then the cause of the punishment he inflicts, Jewish idolatry, may stand for iconoclast iniquity. Indeed, these heretics were not only called “Jewish-minded” (*ἰουδαϊόφρονες*) and “Jewish-like” (*ἰουδαῖζόντες*) by their opponents and said to be as impious as the Israelites;³²² they were also compared to idolaters, not just because they turned against the Church, slandering and persecuting God’s people like the pagan opponents of Christianity had done in the past,³²³ but also because they were often directly

³²¹ See pp. 71-74 above.

³²² The main iconophile argument for this parallelism was that, like the Jews, iconoclasts not only rejected icon veneration but also (and as a result of this) the Incarnation of the Logos in Christ. Examples of this parallelism (and the relevant argumentation) can be found in: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 173C, 196DE, 273CD, 276AB; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 616A, 752C, 761C, 780C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 6 (§3:1-7), 12 (§6:57/61), 42 (§19:50-52), 55 (§25:63), 62 (§28:45-50), 71 (§31:80), 118 (§72:34), 128 (§76:13), 163 (§92:10-12), 256 (§159:53-54), *Twelve chapters*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), I, 458:17-18 (chapter 7); Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 453A, 465A, 473B, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 258 (epistle 142:8-9), 278 (157:13-14/28-29), 279 (157:46/49), 297 (176:16), 336 (214:2-3), 345 (221:73-74/95), 376 (244:10-15), 414 (277:39-40), 441-43 (301:72-73/112-14), 448 (305:32), 457 (314:12-13), 473 (332:27), 491 (358:14-15), 496 (362:9), 525 (381:117), 541 (390:3-4), 546 (393:40-56), 557 (401:23, 402:6), 590 (421:16), 615 (437:25-28), 638 (451:12), 674 (469:51-52), 731 (496:25); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 160:181, 162:240/253, 163:288-91, 190:1009, 192:1069-71; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 338:18, 751:16-17, 783:15-784:5, 784:20, 803:14-15, 800:9; *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 74 (§12:5-6), 78 (§16:1-2), 79 (§18:11); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1984-85), 14 (1:405). For the polemic against the Jews in the ninth-century marginal psalters see Corrigan (1992), 43-61.

³²³ Who are usually called “Greeks” in iconophile texts. Examples of such comparisons in: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 164C-165C, 165D, 173C, 188AB, 196DE, 273C-280C; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 509A, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 612C, 616A, 653D, 752C, 761C, 780C, 813C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 163 (§ 92:10-12), 256 (§159:62), *Twelve chapters*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), I, 458:17-18 (chapter 7); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 413 (epistle 277:32), 441 (301:73), 457 (314:12-

accused of adoring idols themselves.³²⁴ Such characterisations were in line with a long tradition of Christian literature, in which heretics were assimilated to the two principle opponents of the Church in her first steps, the Jews and the heathens.³²⁵ Especially the claim that iconoclasts were idolaters was intended to inverse the iconoclast accusation that icons were idols.³²⁶ In the light of such iconophile polemics, it seems justifiable to view the scene of the Jews adoring Beelphegor as a typological reference to iconoclast unrighteousness, punished by the hand of Phineas, whose killing of the idolatrous Zambri and Chasbi can then be interpreted as an allusion to the victory of Orthodoxy over iconoclasm.

A similar typological reading can be applied to the pair of miniatures coming after that of the triumphant Phineas, to those where the Jews are sacrificing their children and then dragged into captivity. Apart from making a general typological reference to the punishment of all iniquities, including iconoclasm, these two scenes can be taken to reflect more particular facets of iconophile thought. The scene of the Israelites sacrificing their children to demons recalls iconophile charges that the “Jewish-minded” iconoclasts were so evil that they worshiped demons and offered them up human lives. George the monk puts forward such an accusation against the iconoclast Constantine V, specifically mentioning the sacrifice of a child.³²⁷ The emperor is accused of a similar crime in the *Life of Stephen the Younger*.³²⁸ In the *Life of Empress Eirene* Constantine V is again said to perform sacrifices to demons, although not of human lives.³²⁹ Furthermore, the iconoclasts’ extreme iniquity, the worst expression of which was the destruction of holy icons, was declared by the iconophiles to be the cause of God’s wrath against the Byzantine empire, manifested

13), 496 (362:9), 546 (393:55); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 765:1-3; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 170:17-18 (§70); *Life of Empress Eirene*, ed. Halkin (1988), 7 (§1); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 74-75 (§12:2-5/9-10); *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1249D; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1984-85), 14 (1:395/399).

³²⁴ Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 220A, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 745D, 808A, 812A, *Apologeticus minor*, PG 100, 844C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 125 (§75:51-52), 140 (§81:33-35); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 751:19-752:11; *Life of Empress Eirene*, ed. Halkin (1988), 7 (§1);

³²⁵ Examples in the Acts of the following ecumenical council; the first, *Mansi II*, 644AB, 749E, 889B; the third, *Mansi IV*, 897B, 1108B, 1184A, 1245D, 1249B-D, 1441A, *Mansi V*, 4B, 433C, 460E; the fourth, *Mansi VII*, 249BC; the fifth, *Mansi IX*, 513B, 572E, 576CD, 641B; the sixth, *Mansi XI*, 632E, 721E, 933DE, 937A/C.

³²⁶ For the discussion on the relation between icons and idols during Iconoclasm see Parry (1996), 44-51; also Corrigan (1992), 27-43, with references to ninth-century marginal psalter illustration.

³²⁷ *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 751:20, 752:4-5/7-11.

³²⁸ Ed. Auzépy (1997), 165:18-21 (§64).

³²⁹ Ed. Halkin (1988), 7 (§1).

in the outbreak of various calamities, among which were raids by foreign nations resulting in the slaughter and capture of many Byzantines.³³⁰ In the ninth century the marginal psalter miniatures of the Babylonians taking the Jews into captivity as a consequence of their impious behaviour may have been read as allusions to these iconophile allegations.

Yet another typological reading is applicable to this pair of miniatures. In Early Christian and Byzantine literature the Jewish captivity to the Babylonians is used as a type of the captivity of human nature to sin and impiety.³³¹ Theodoret's psalm commentary gives characteristic examples of this tropological reading, frequently comparing the slavery of the Israelites to the Babylonians with the adversity and suffering a Christian has to face in life (although not in relation to Psalm 105).³³² In the literary tradition of Byzantium it is also common to call Babylonians (or Assyrians) the heretics who keep prisoners to falsity the new chosen people of God, the Christians, and especially name heretic (or idolatrous) emperors after Nabuchodonosor, the Babylonian king who enslaved the Jews, stole part of the Temple's sacred vessels and persecuted the Three Hebrews for their refusal to adore his golden idol (*Daniel* 1:1-2, 3:1-33).³³³

Frequently found in iconophile texts,³³⁴ such expressions suggest that the Jewish captivity to the Babylonians illustrating Psalm 105:40-41 in the Chludov and

³³⁰ For the various calamities see pp. 81-82, n. 229 above. For specific mention of wars with foreign nations, defeats, slaughter and captivity of numerous Byzantines see: *Life of Empress Theodora*, ed. Markopoulos (1983), 263 (§7); *Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Theophilos*, ed. Munitiz et alii (1997), 75:27-77:5 (§13.a); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 797:25-798:7.

³³¹ For example, Gregory Nazianzenus, *In novam dominicam*, PG 36, 608B; Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), V, 127:27-30 (no. 237). See also Lampe (1961), 282, “*Βαβυλών*”, 1;3, and 54, “*αἰχμαλωσία*”, 1;2.

³³² *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1240C (Psalm 50), 1288C (Psalm 55:13), 1545C (Psalm 84:1), 1568BC (Psalm 87), 1676B (Psalm 101), 1740C (Psalm 106:11-12). See also p. 110, n. 350 below.

³³³ Examples in: Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* III, 532E; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1245D; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 1193A; Gregory of Nyssa, *In Meletium (Sermones)*, ed. Heil et alii (1967), 453:5-17; Gregory Nazianzenus, *In Juliano*, PG 35, 532B.

³³⁴ Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 160BC, 173C, 401B; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 553B, 577C; John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 140 (III.35) with reference to Baltasar, son of Nabuchodonosor, punished by God for defiling the sacred vessels of the Jewish Temple (*Daniel* 5); Constantine V compared to Nabuchodonosor in Patriarch Nikephoros' *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 220C, 276C and *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 79 (§36:26); Leo V compared to Nabuchodonosor or said to have “an Assyrian mind” by Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 417 (epistle 278:45), 419 (279:18), 587 (419:15-16), 612 (435:30); In the *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 98:23 (§9) Leo III is compared to Baltasar, 106:4 (§14), and 166:13 (§65) Constantine V is compared to Nabuchodonosor; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 797:18-19, compares Theophilos to Baltasar, and 800:11-12/15-16, to Nabuchodonosor. See also p. 110, n. 352 below, for the Three Hebrews.

the Paris marginal Psalter may have been read by the ninth-century iconophile audience as an allusion to the captivity of the Orthodox Church to the “Babylonian” heresy of iconoclasm. In that case, the Jewish iniquity of sacrificing the children of Israel, which was the reason for the God-sent punishment of captivity, may have been seen as a reference to the sins of the New Israel, the Christians. Certain iconophile authors say outright that God punished the Christians with the eruption of iconoclasm because of their previous ungodly behaviour.³³⁵

In conclusion we may sum up that a number of the Old Testament illustrations in the Chludov and the Paris marginal Psalters for Psalm 105:28-41 are likely to have typological significance and refer to iconoclast iniquity and its punishment. The introduction and portrayal of Phineas is a major factor in support of this interpretation, his role being to act as a model of the victorious defender of true faith, just as he does in iconophile texts. It is suggested that the layout of the relevant opening in the two codices was designed so as to give support to this line of thought. In the following pages a similar interpretation will be applied to another opening of the Chludov Psalter, which shows various episodes of Jewish history in one of the most sophisticated compositional arrangements of the entire codex.

Psalms 77-78: The suffering of the New Israel in the hands of iconoclasts
(Chludov Psalter, folios 78v-79r)

Folios 78v-79r of the Chludov Psalter contain an exceptionally dense series of seven different scenes, that take up the entire space in the margins of both pages (figs 99-100). The layout of the two folios has certain compositional similarities, which suggest that the miniatures were designed as a group and that only if they are read as such can their message be fully understood. In the upper margin of folio 78v (fig. 99), the Jews are worshipping a demon on a hill – Psalm 77:58; in the next picture below that they are being killed by their enemies – Psalm 77:62, 64. These two scenes are balanced on the opposite page (folio 79r, fig. 100) by two pictures, the upper one being the bust of the Virgin and Child inside the precinct of a building inscribed “the Holy Zion” on top of a hill – Psalm 77:68-69; below it is the scene of David

³³⁵ For example, Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 384D, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 556D-557A; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 194 (epistle 73:19-21), 411 (276:77-81).

surrounded by his peaceful flock as he is being anointed by Samuel –Psalm 77:70. The compositions at the bottom of the two pages may have been meant to act as pendants. On folio 78v the scene of Christ rising from the Tomb (Psalm 77:65) is framed on the left by the Jews being dragged into captivity (Psalm 77:61) and on the right (across folio 79r) by Antiochos ordering the killing of the Seven Maccabees being executed in front of him (Psalm 78:1-2).³³⁶ In other words, Jesus' victory over death appears between two episodes of the Israelites suffering at the hands of foreign kings.

The suggestion that this opening is carefully designed to create visual analogies between the miniatures of the two pages facing each other, may be supported by checking how the scenes relate to the psalm-text sequence. The correct sequence, clearly indicated by reference marks, would have been to show the Jews being dragged into captivity (verse 61) before they are killed by their enemies (verses 62, 64). It is certain that the two miniatures have not been placed as they are because of lack of space, given that they are of much the same size and could very well have been put in the same order as the narrative. It is possible that their actual sequence was decided on so as to make the events seem more natural: first the Israelites are defeated in battle by other nations and then they are dragged into captivity. A case that may be adduced in support of this is folio 108v of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 101), where the punishment of Dathan and Abiron is depicted prior to the scene of the Jews murmuring against Moses, and so follows the chronology of *Numbers* 16:31-35/41 rather than the psalm illustrated (105:16-18), which mentions the events in the opposite order.³³⁷ However, I want to suggest that the reason for the inversion on folio 78v reflects a more complex theological message.

To reach a conclusion about the design of this opening requires an appreciation of the strategy used to plan the miniatures of the Chludov Psalter. A basic principle followed throughout this manuscript is that the miniatures appear as close as possible to the corresponding psalm text, and that the picture sequence follows the text. The rare exceptions to this rule can be attributed to three reasons:

³³⁶ The identification of the scene is secured by the inscription: *ANTIOXOC OTE ANHΛΩCEN TOYC EΠITΛ MAKKABEIC* (Antiochos when he killed the Seven Maccabees – Ščepkina [1977]).

³³⁷ Corrigan (1992), 35, n.48.

1. to recreate the chronological order of events, as attested on folio 108v, mentioned above (fig. 101);
2. to interrelate with other miniatures so that a specific message can be conveyed, as was examined in the case of the drowned Pharaoh on folio 72v (p. 88, fig. 66);
3. to possible lack of space, as in the case of the inversion on folio 44r (a reason not applicable to folio 78v); but a closer analysis of this case may lead to a different conclusion.

Psalm 43:23 “For, for thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for slaughter” is illustrated on folio 44r of the Chludov Psalter by two miniatures (fig. 102). In the top right corner of the page, next to the relevant psalm passage is the decapitation of martyrs for Christ’s sake (*OI MARTYPOYNTEC YHIEP TOY ONOMATOC TOY XY*). The martyrdom of St George on the wheel, clearly linked by a reference mark to Psalm 43:23, could not fit immediately below this scene, and is moved to the bottom left of the page. In between these two miniatures for verse 23 are three other scenes, which illustrate Psalms 43:24/27 and 44:2. This placement of St George’s martyrdom out of sequence and adjacent to the medallion with the Virgin and Child illustrating verse 44:2, has created a significant visual effect that was most probably planned by the artist and not caused by chance: the round torture wheel echoes the almost identically-sized roundel in which the Virgin and Child appear, with both images shown at almost the same level. This correspondence links the two miniatures together, emphasizing the fact that St George was martyred because he believed in the Incarnation of the Logos in the person of Christ, a truth affirmed in the medallion where Jesus is shown in the arms of his mother from whom he took his human nature.³³⁸ Since this roundel resembles the circular icons that appear elsewhere in the psalter,³³⁹ the interrelated composition of these two scenes implies that the truth of the Incarnation, for the sake of which St George was martyred, is manifested through the depiction of Christ in icons – the foremost iconophile argument. In this way, the saint has been visually transformed into a model of iconophile martyrs, who

³³⁸ For the argument that Christ was human and circumscribable because of his relation with his mother see, for example, Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 99, 413CD, 417AB; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 265A, 269BC. See also Tsironis (2000); Parry (1996), 199.

³³⁹ See p. 39, n. 53 above.

suffered for believing that icon veneration is a Christian duty in the name of the Incarnation.

Indeed, in iconophile literature it is often implied, and some times even explicitly stated that Christians persecuted for their adherence to the veneration of icons are imitators of the earlier martyrs of the Church.³⁴⁰ Moreover, two epistles of Theodore the Studite using Psalm 43:23 to describe the persecutions undergone by the iconophiles offer additional evidence that the martyrdom of St George illustrating this verse in the Chludov Psalter (and the beheading of the anonymous martyrs at the top of the page) may have been read in the ninth century as an implicit reference to the sufferings of iconophiles at the hands of their opponents.³⁴¹ In fact, in the second of these epistles Theodore compares the suffering of iconophiles to the martyrdom of great saints among whom he mentions St George.³⁴² In the light of iconophile literature, an additional allusion of this synthesis could be that, besides icons of Jesus and the Virgin, images of saints who suffered for the Christian faith are also venerable, since they not only honour those worthy men and women, but offer examples of courage and piety that all Christians should imitate.³⁴³ The martyrdom of those venerable saints for their refusal to worship idols is further proof of the iconophile tenet that holy icons are not idols as the iconoclasts protested.³⁴⁴ Indeed, martyrdom scenes are often quoted in iconophile sources in order to demonstrate the

³⁴⁰ The comparison is implicit in the emphatic description of the persecuted iconophiles' suffering in various texts, such as by Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 250 (epistle 133:2-10), 258 (142:7-24); *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 160-162 (§58-60); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 141BC. For examples of explicit comparison, Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 377 (epistle 245:29-30), 352 (223:42-56), 461 (317:16-30), 521-28 (epistles 381-82); *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 170:17-18 (§70); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 135 (§49:10-15); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 765:1-3, and *Life of Empress Eirene*, ed. Halkin (1988), 7 (§1), where Constantine V is compared to Diocletian for his persecutions against Christians. See also pp. 113-14 below for the comparison between iconophiles and the Seven Maccabees.

³⁴¹ Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 293 (epistle 172:17-18), 441 (301:52-53).

³⁴² Ed. Fatouros (1992), 440 (epistle 301:28-32). The other saints mentioned by name are Peter, Paul, Theodore, Thekla and Fevronia.

³⁴³ For example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 108:38-40 (I.21, II.15), 149-153 (I.37-48, II. 33-44); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 240B, 300C, 301E-304D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 188-89 (§107:20-50), 202 (§114:53-71), 242 (§149:29-34). See also Brubaker (1999), 256-57.

³⁴⁴ This argument was prominent in the work of Leontios of Neapolis *Contra Iudaeos*, the relevant passages of which were cited by John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 180 (III.87:29-38); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 48B/D (and similar arguments in 188AB, 217E); Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 167/168 (§92:127-139/157-160).

commemorative and didactic power of icons,³⁴⁵ and four miniatures with the relative subject matter appear in the pages of the Chludov Psalter.³⁴⁶

Is the imagery on folio 44r of the Chludov Psalter out of sequence due to lack of space, or was it to make some iconophile point? Was the visual correlation of the torture wheel and the medallion-icon accidental or not? Since the image of St George's martyrdom could well have been left out if lack of space in its correct position had been the reason, we may assume that the artist placed it where he did to create an eloquent visual argument. A really decisive conclusion does not seem possible in this case, but the possibility remains that we have a deliberate inversion here, as was argued also in the case of folio 72v in the arrangement of the figure of the drowned Pharaoh. Similarly on folio 65r, the image of Christ exorcising the man from Gerasos (Psalm 67:13) is specially arranged around an icon in order to make a conceptual point (see pp. 137-39, fig. 111).

Of the four cases mentioned above of miniatures being out of sequence with the literal order of the text in the illustration of the Chludov Psalter (folios 44r, 65r, 72v, 108v), the first three enhance the iconophile connotations of the imagery (even if on folio 44r this might have not been the reason for the inversion). To find out whether there is also an analogous significance behind the inverted order of the killing and the captivity of the Jews on folio 78v of the Chludov Psalter will need further consideration of the text of Psalm 77 and how it was read in Byzantium.

Psalm 77:58-65 describes how the Israelites caused the wrath of God by their idolatry and were punished with captivity and slaughter, until the Lord came again to their rescue. This is illustrated with the Jews adoring a demon (to make the point that idols are demonic) and, as a consequence, being killed by their enemies and dragged into captivity. The salvation referred to in Psalm 77:65 is visually interpreted as a prophesy concerning Christ's Resurrection, according to the commentary of Pseudo-

³⁴⁵ For example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 146 (I.34, II.30, III.46), and Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 80CD, both quote a homily by St Basil on Barlaam, mentioning paintings that showed his martyrdom. In the *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 135-141 (§49-51), the patriarch is said to have commissioned the decoration of churches with martyrdom scenes of various saints, that would work as moral examples for the viewers (commented by Wolska-Conus (1980), esp. 253-54; Walter (1980) for an attempted identification of the scenes mentioned).

³⁴⁶ Aside the two scenes on folio 44r, a martyred monk appears on folio 22v (fig. 199), and the martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees on folio 79r (commented below, pp. 112-19, fig. 100). For a review of iconophile tenets on the icons of the saints (and the Virgin) see also Parry (1996), 191-201.

Athanasios.³⁴⁷ Christ is seen in front of the Sepulchre and David standing on his right is prophesying his triumph over death.³⁴⁸ This folio gives a clear visual continuum between the Old Testament ill deeds and misfortunes of the Jews and the New Testament victory of Christ over death. The presence of the Risen Christ at the end of the sequence is a very powerful piece of Christian theology and interpretation of the psalm; Judaism could never interpret the Old Testament like this. It declares that the true salvation of the chosen people of God comes through the Incarnation of the Logos. Consequently, the miniatures can be read in two ways, either historically or typologically. In the first case, the Israelites are shown suffering for their sins in expectation of the Messiah, who comes (according the Christian history) in the person of Christ. In the second case, the Old Israel can be seen as a type of the new chosen people of God, who through their faith in the Incarnation and the Resurrection of the Lord are saved from their previous decadent state, idolatry and slavery to sin. In the historical reading, the captivity follows the slaughter, although in the psalm they are mentioned in the opposite order. The visual adjustment acquires a logic of cause and consequence - the Israelites are first defeated and then captured. In the typological reading, the inversion allows for a direct interrelation between the captivity and the Resurrection, through which the underlying message of the composition can be better communicated. Christian authors not only saw the captivity of the Jews to the Babylonians as a type of the slavery of mankind to the devil or to sin, idolatry and ignorance,³⁴⁹ but also attributed the salvation from these conditions to the Incarnation and victory of Christ over death. For example, in his psalm commentary Theodoret often mentions the deliverance of humanity from Christ when talking about the Jewish captivity to the Babylonians (although not in relation to Psalm 77).³⁵⁰ This kind of commentary would seem to explain the shift from Old to New Testament imagery, as well as the inversion of scenes on folio 78v so that the captivity episode could appear next to the Resurrection.

One of the difficulties of interpreting the visual significance of the Chludov Psalter comes up again at this point. To use the commentaries of Theodoret offers us a

³⁴⁷ *In psalmos*, PG 27, 984C.

³⁴⁸ Corrigan (1992), 68.

³⁴⁹ See p. 104 above.

³⁵⁰ *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1328BC (Psalm 60:7-8), 1348AB (Psalm 64:2-3), 1361AB (Psalm 65:1-2), 1362B (Psalm 65:2), 1388B (Psalm 67:18-19), 1428A (Psalm 70:20), 1537CD (Psalm 83:2-3), 1644D-1645A (Psalm 5:1), 1685A/C (Psalm 102:1/4), 1740B/1741A (Psalm 106:9-10/15-16), 1749B (Psalm 107). See also Theodoret's *In Ezechielem*, PG 81, 1189D-1192A (commented by Cutler [1992], 51).

general Early Christian perspective, and one that was well known to later theologians who read his widely circulated commentaries on the psalms. But is it possible to demonstrate more precise echoes of iconophile thought and reasoning in the eighth and ninth centuries? This needs further investigation.

From the historical point of view, the iconophile significance of the illustrations on folio 78v might be taken to suggest that the iniquity of idolatry, perpetrated both by the Jews,³⁵¹ and by the Babylonians who held them in captivity,³⁵² was uprooted by the coming of Christ. In one of their refutations of iconoclast accusations, iconophiles argued that an image of Christ, the person who invalidated idols, cannot *ipso facto* be an idol itself.³⁵³ This antithesis between icons and idols, presented in other Chludov miniatures as well,³⁵⁴ is also emphasized by the miniature that follows Christ's Resurrection on folio 79r. As mentioned above, the bust of the Virgin and Child (compositionally strongly reminiscent of an icon) that appears in the precinct of a building inscribed "the Holy Zion" on top of a hill, gives emphasis to the reality of the Incarnation, as opposed to the falsity of the idols adored by the Jews in the form of a demon sited on a hill, on the facing page.³⁵⁵

On the basis of ideas commonly found in iconophile literature, a typological interpretation of the miniatures on folio 78v can be approached in two ways, as already suggested for the similar miniatures on folio 110r. Either the idolatry of the Old Israel, punished by the God-sent captivity to the Babylonians, may be viewed as

³⁵¹ A commonplace accusation in iconophile texts, following the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature. For examples see: John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 71 (II.4), 115 (II.17), 120 (II.20); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 96CD, 109-113. See also Corrigan (1992), 35-37.

³⁵² The story of the Three Hebrews who refused to adore Nabuchodonosor's golden image and were thrown in the fiery furnace from which they were miraculously saved (*Daniel* III) is quoted in iconophile texts from two points of view: either to stress that the iconoclast emperors are like Nabuchodonosor, destroying Christ's icons and replacing them with their own image (Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus* I, PG 276CD; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros [1992], 417 [epistle 278:45-46/51-53], 419 [279:15-20]; *Canon in erectione SS. imaginum*, PG 99, 1776A); or to emphasize that since the Orthodox Church venerates the Three Hebrews for their refusal to adore an idol, it is obvious that her holy icons are not idols themselves (John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter [1975], 180 [III.87], and Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* III, 48BC, both quoting Leontios of Neapolis). The picture of the Three Hebrews in the furnace illustrating the relevant canticle in the Chludov Psalter (folio 160v) and the Pantokrator Psalter (folio 222r, Dufrenne [1966], 37, pl. 33) may have had such iconophile connotations for the ninth-century viewers.

³⁵³ See Parry (1996), 44-51, for a review of iconophile tenets on this issue. Some characteristic references in: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 963C, 1002E, 1010E, *Mansi* XIII, 132, 188AB, 373E, 397DE, 408DE, 409E-412A, 446D-447C, 482, 216, 229, 232, 353E; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 553CD617-20, 633-36, 688-93, 705-12, 740-41.

³⁵⁴ Especially on folio 64r (fig. 184), where the rock not cut by human hands (type of Christ) destroys the idols, and an icon of the Virgin and Child appears on the holy mountain (type of the Theotokos) from which the rock has been extracted. See Corrigan (1992), 37-40, also 33-37.

³⁵⁵ See also Corrigan (1992), 93, 97.

an allusion to the iniquity of the New Israel (the Christians) leading to the outbreak of iconoclasm that kept the Orthodox Church in bondage to heresy. Alternatively, the typological reading rests on those iconophile texts that accuse iconoclast impiety (sometimes specifically paralleled with idolatry) for being responsible for God's wrath against the Byzantine empire as manifested in various calamities, including barbarous invasions which resulted in the slaughter and captivity of many Byzantines.

Like the Chludov Psalter illustration of Psalm 105 on folios 109v-110r, the scenes on folio 78v seem designed to present Israelite history as a type for Byzantine iconoclasm. In the light of this conclusion, let us look again at folio 79r (fig. 100). As noted above, the bust of the Virgin and Child inside the precinct of a building inscribed "the Holy Zion" illustrate psalm 77:68-69. David's anointment (Psalm 77:70) can be seen to complement this image as an Old Testament prefiguration of the Incarnation (since the anointed forefather prefigures Christ, the man anointed with divinity.³⁵⁶ Note also the antithesis between David's peaceful flock below the image of the Virgin and Child – an allusion to the pious Christian flock? – and the massacre of the impious Jews below the figure of a demon on the facing folio.) The entire lower margin of folio 79r shows the execution of the Seven Maccabees by order of Antiochos (for Psalm 78:1-2).

To understand the full theological import of this page we should remember how these texts were read in Byzantium. Psalm 78, narrating the sufferings of Israel at the hands of impious nations, was considered a prophesy of the story of the Maccabees, who fought and died for their faith while persecuted by Antiochos Epiphanis. This interpretation of Psalm 78 appears in the psalm commentaries of Eusebios, Athanasios and Theodoret.³⁵⁷ It seems that the martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees, narrated in *II.Maccabees* 7:1-42, may already have been a subject for illustrating Psalm 78:1-2 before the ninth century, since it appear in this context on folio 132v of the Bristol Psalter which can be argued to reflect an early tradition.³⁵⁸ A similar scene can be seen on folio 110r of the Pantokrator Psalter (fig. 103) – the relevant text is missing from the Paris marginal Psalter.

In all three instances the composition consists of the same basic elements: Antiochos is enthroned in the foreground of a city with high walls and buildings with

³⁵⁶ See p. 48, n. 77 above.

³⁵⁷ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 941-44; *In psalmos*, PG 27, 357CD; *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1504BC, 1508A.

³⁵⁸ Dufrenne (1966), 62, pl. 55.

gabled or domed roofs. He has just ordered the beheading of the martyrs, who are lying before him in a pile of bleeding bodies, massacred by the executioner's sword. Since these Old Testament heroes were killed by an idolatrous king (together with their mother, and their tutor Eleazar who is mentioned in *II.Maccabees* 6:18-31) because they refused to betray their faith, they were considered by the Christian Church as models of pious behaviour and steadfast respect to religious tradition, and were venerated from an early date.³⁵⁹ Their cult was quite widespread both in the East and the West, and from the third century onwards they were frequently mentioned in patristic texts as exemplary martyrs, to be imitated for their courage in the face of evil, not only where the faith was threatened by unbelievers or heretics, but also in the daily battle against sin and temptation.³⁶⁰ Related to and indicative of the typological use of the Maccabees in Byzantine literature is their appearance in early Armenian historiography, where soldiers killed in battle, especially in the name of religious freedom and adherence to tradition, are frequently compared to those Old Testament champions of piety.³⁶¹

In iconophile literature, the frequent references to the persecution of the Maccabees as analogous to that of the iconophile martyrs continues this tradition, but with a new dynamic. In the *Life of Michael the Synkellos*, the two iconophile monks known as *Graptoi* (because one of the tortures they had undergone by order of Emperor Theophilus was to have their foreheads tattooed with verses), are described as descendants of the Seven Maccabees and Eleazar, whose bravery brought shame upon the idolatrous Antiochos.³⁶² In another passage of the same text, the endurance of the two brothers during their tortures is said to have been like Eleazar's.³⁶³ In the *Life of Stephen the Younger*, the mistreatment undergone by this iconophile martyr is paralleled to that of Eleazar.³⁶⁴

³⁵⁹ McGrath (1965), 260, notes 33 and 39 for further bibliography.

³⁶⁰ For example, Gregory Nazianzenus, *In Macchabaeorum laudem*, PG 35, 912-933, esp. 912A, 913A/C, 920AB, 921A, 928C, 932CD; John Chrysostom, *In sanctos Maccabaeos*, PG 50, 617-628, esp. 618, 622, where they are presented as Christian saints; likewise in the troparion sung on their feast day (August 1st) according to the *Typikon of the Great Church* (ed. Mateos [1962-63], I, 356). For the Christian cult of the Seven Maccabees, and the influence of the *Book of the Maccabees* on the literature of Christian martyrdom see Delehay (1966), 134-35, 163-65.

³⁶¹ Thomson (1975). For an analogous usage of the Maccabees in political and religious polemics in the tenth and eleventh century in the West see Dunbabin (1985).

³⁶² Ed. Cunningham (1991), 96:29-31.

³⁶³ Ed. Cunningham (1991), 84:7.

³⁶⁴ Ed. Auzépy (1997), 143:22-24 (§44).

Moreover, implicit and explicit references to the Maccabees are frequent in the epistles of Theodore the Studite: as mentioned before, in two of them he describes the persecution of iconophiles by using Psalm 43:23,³⁶⁵ which in the psalm commentaries of Theodoret and Diodoros was interpreted as a reference to the martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees with their mother and Eleazar.³⁶⁶ In another epistle, when he wants to encourage the recipient to remain steadfast in his iconophile faith despite possible persecution, Theodore asks rhetorically: “Are we going to lose heart when old men and young children have defeated tyrants and kings?”³⁶⁷ Most probably, the “old men and young children” are a reference to Eleazar and the Seven Maccabees.³⁶⁸ Elsewhere in his epistles Theodore mentions the Maccabees as martyred for their refusal to eat pork because it was against their law, compares them to the iconophiles persecuted for their refusal to deny the holy icons, and concludes that the iconophiles are at least as praiseworthy as their Old Testament models.³⁶⁹

Finally, a significant use of the Maccabees in iconophile polemics comes from the *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*. We read that this militant iconophile had not only praised the martyrs of the Faith in his writings, but had also decorated a number of churches with scenes of saints suffering their martyrdom, in order to both commemorate their bravery and set them up as examples to the faithful. Walter has cogently argued that the first five of the fifteen paragraphs dedicated to the description of such martyrdoms refer to the Maccabees.³⁷⁰ Wolska-Conus has also observed that in this passage the intention of the biographer Ignatios and of the patriarch himself seems to have been to show how the martyrdom of venerable saints resembles the persecution of the iconophiles.³⁷¹ Similar allusions to the sufferings of the supporters of icon-veneration by invoking the sufferings of Christian saints are common in iconophile literature (as already mentioned in the analysis of the martyrdom of St. George on folio 44r, pp. 107-8, fig. 102).

Aside from the above more or less direct references in iconophile sources to the martyrdom of the Maccabees, specific analogies between the Old Testament

³⁶⁵ See p. 108, n. 341 above.

³⁶⁶ *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1177C, 1185A; *In psalmos*, ed. Olivier (1980), 260.

³⁶⁷ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 461 (epistle 317:24-25).

³⁶⁸ Cf. John Chrysostom, *In sanctos Maccabaeos*, PG 50, 619, where the seven brothers are called “μειράκια” (young boys) and Eleazar “γέρον” (old man).

³⁶⁹ Ed. Fatouros (1992), 443 (epistle 301:120-128), 523 (381:70-73).

³⁷⁰ Walter (1980), 257-58.

³⁷¹ Wolska-Conus (1980), 247-48, 253.

events, on the one hand, and certain episodes of the iconoclast crisis as reported by the iconophiles, on the other, make the comparison between the biblical martyrs and the persecuted supporters of icons particularly apt. The idolatrous king Antiochos is said to have desecrated the Temple of Jerusalem, deprived it from its sacred vessels, and burned the holy books of the Jews (*I. Maccabees* 1:21-23/56-57). Likewise, iconoclasts – who were also said to be idolatrous – were constantly accused by their opponents of not only destroying icons, but also of profaning or devastating churches, demolishing altars, burning or recasting holy vessels, and mutilating or throwing into the fire holy books decorated with images or containing texts in support of icon veneration.³⁷² Furthermore, the Maccabean adherence to religious tradition, emphasized in both the Old Testament narrative and Christian literature,³⁷³ was also supposed to be one of the most fundamental virtues of the supporters of icons. Their struggle in favour of the veneration of holy images was constantly praised in iconophile polemics as a consequence of their determination to preserve a long-lived tradition of the Orthodox Church and resist the iniquitous novelty of iconoclasm.³⁷⁴

In the light of this analysis, it is likely that ninth-century iconophile viewers of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalter would perceive the depiction of the martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees illustrating Psalm 78:1-2 as a reference to the persecution the supporters of icon veneration suffered at the hands of impious iconoclast emperors. This would be even more certain if they were familiar with the commentaries on Psalm 78 which engage in typological and tropological interpretations. They may have known the commentary of Eusebios, who saw Psalm 78 as a reference to all kinds of persecution.³⁷⁵ Didymos saw Psalm 87 as an account of the devastation brought about by heresy. For him, the nations that kill the people of God and spill their blood around Jerusalem (Psalm 78:1/3) were a metaphor for

³⁷² Examples in: Patriarch Germanos, *De haeresibus et synodis*, PG 98, 80BC; Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 184D-185A, 188B, 189, 192DE (for the destruction or mutilation of books; on this issue see also Corrigan [1992], 116-17, with previous bibliography); Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 12 (§6:67-69), 48 (§22:49-62), 292 (§184:20-24); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 230 (epistle 112:22-27), 414 (277:42-47), 417 (278:46-49), 457 (314:16-22), 464 (321:11), 641 (452:66-67), 812 (538:37-39); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 757:18-21, 767:1-3; *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 75 (§13:5-7).

³⁷³ In *II Maccabees* 6:1/5/23/28/, 7:2/9/11/23/24/30/37 the key word is “laws (of the fathers)” (“[πατρώοι] νόμοι”). The Maccabean adherence to tradition is emphasized, for example, by Gregory Nazianzenus, *In Macchabaeorum laudem*, PG 35, 912A, 920B, 921A, 924AB; *Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos (1962-63), I, 356.

³⁷⁴ See Parry (1996), 44-51; Giakalis (1994), 22-50; also Brubaker (1999), 39-41; Brubaker (1989a), 42-56.

³⁷⁵ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 945-948.

unclean thoughts that drive one away from true belief, and cause one's strength of soul to be shed and wasted. He also saw in the neighbouring nations mocking the people of God (Psalm 78:4) an allusion to heretics who attack the true faith of Orthodox Christians.³⁷⁶

The way that the martyrdom of the Seven Maccabees is portrayed in the Chludov Psalter is especially pointed (fig. 100, detail in fig. 104). One of the domed buildings in the city in front of which Antiochos is enthroned is topped by what seems to be a cross. This element alters the chronology of the episode depicted, transferring it from Old Testament times into the Christian era. It implies that the iniquitous king defiled a Christian church instead of the Temple of Jerusalem, and ordered the execution of Christian rather than Hebrew martyrs refusing to betray their religious tradition, exactly as did the iconophiles who suffered at the hands of iconoclast emperors. Antiochos holds a sceptre identical to the rod that Moses carries in many of his representations in the Chludov Psalter (figs 70, 73, 105, 182).³⁷⁷ No other king is depicted holding such a sceptre in the illustration of the Chludov Psalter; no Jewish king in pictures that otherwise emphasize his royal status,³⁷⁸ nor any foreign king.³⁷⁹ Perhaps the artist wished to indicate that Antiochos had usurped the authority Moses held as leader of the Israelites and used it wrongly, to harm rather than save the people of God. The position and shape of the sceptre, shown almost parallel to the sword with which the executioner is beheading the Maccabees, implies that like an anti-Moses, Antiochos uses his sceptre to cover in a red sea of blood God's chosen people, whom Moses with his rod led safely through the parting waters of the Red Sea.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁶ *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 132:10, 133:10-11/16-21 (\$816-817).

³⁷⁷ Folios 76r, 77r, 82r, 107r, 108r, 148v. Without the rod on folios 78r, 90v, 98v, 106v, 108v. Moses carries a rod of the same shape (a baton that ends with a large round knob) in the Pantokrator Psalter, folios 103v (fig. 71), 104r, 114r (fig. 183), 151v, 206r (fig. 74); in the Paris marginal Psalter, folios 15r, 16r (fig. 72); and in cod. Paris. gr. 510, folios 226v, 264v (fig. 75; Brubaker [1999], 337). A similar rod (with an additional knob at its other end) is carried by Aaron on the sixth-century Basilevsky Pyxis (St Petersburg, Hermitage Museum, fig. 9) and by Joseph in the Nativity scene of the sixth-century Werden Pyxis (Werden, Abteikirche). See Clair (1984), 23, figs 4, 6, 7, with reference to the Christian tradition that relates the rod used by Moses and Aaron to perform miracles with Joseph's rod. The ninth-century codices and the sixth-century pyxides attest to a specific iconographic tradition for the depiction of this object. Gioles (2002), 74, mentions that in some rare instances the Byzantine emperor is shown holding a sceptre ending in a sphere, but does not mention specific examples.

³⁷⁸ Like Saul on folios 51r, 52v; David on folios 50r, 55v, 58r; and Ezekias on folio 18v.

³⁷⁹ Like the Pharaoh on folio 106v, or the ruler represented on folio 29v (with guise very similar to that of Antiochos).

³⁸⁰ In fact, Gregory Nazianzenus, *In Macchabaeorum laudem*, PG 35, 121A, and Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1508C, mention that the Maccabees were descendants of the people for whom God had performed the miracle of the crossing of the Red Sea. In this way the writers intend to underline

If such an evocative interpretation is accepted, Antiochos may have stood for “anti-emperors” of Byzantium, the heretic iconoclast rulers who, instead of safeguarding the New Israel, devastated it with their persecutions. There is support for this in the ubiquitous assimilation of Orthodox emperors from Constantine onwards with Moses, and the fact that the rod of the prophet was kept as a holy relic and an emblem of God-sent authority in the Palace of Constantinople, and carried in front of the emperor in official processions.³⁸¹ The iconoclast emperors obviously appropriated this rhetoric and ceremonial tradition of imperial glorification too, but in the eyes of iconophiles they remained iniquitous tyrants, like Antiochos, who usurped the authority God had bestowed on the leaders of the New Israel, and made the Lord’s chosen people, like true descendants of the glorious Maccabees, suffer for their steadfast faith in their religious tradition. We do find that in the *Life of Stephen the Younger*, with reference to the iconoclast Emperor Constantine V and his destruction of the holy images in the church of Blachernai and to the persecutions of iconophiles ordered by him, the author cites parts of Psalm 78:1-2, making a few significant additions (marked in the quotation below in italics) in order to emphasize his reference to the contemporary events of the iconoclast crisis: “O God, the heathen are come into thine inheritance; they have polluted thy holy temple; they have made *the spiritual* Jerusalem, *the Church*, a storehouse of fruits, (they have given) the flesh of thy holy ones, *martyrs and monks, their honourable relics* to the wild beast of the earth, *fire and the depths of the sea.*”³⁸² Patriarch Nikephoros also uses Psalm 78:1 when speaking about iconoclasts in his *Apologeticus*, paraphrasing the verse to emphasize that these heretics are worse than the idolatrous nations that persecuted the Maccabees: “*Not heathens but people more unwise than* heathens are come into thine inheritance, *seeking to surpass them (the heathens) on account of their iniquity against your holy men...* They have polluted thy holy temple *and have defiled and dishonoured your altars.*”³⁸³ It seems likely that the miniatures on folio 79r of the Chludov Psalter present a similar typological meditation of anti-iconoclastic overtones on the significance of Psalm 78:1-2.

the martyrs’ venerable legacy and emphasize the iniquity of the tyrant who persecutes men of such a glorious tradition.

³⁸¹ See p. 92, n. 277 above.

³⁸² Ed. Auzépy (1997), 126:24-127:13 (§29).

³⁸³ PG 100, 756AB.

Let us now consider the imagery placed above the Maccabees on folio 79r. At the very top of the page, the Virgin and Child are represented like an icon and protected inside Holy Zion, chosen by God according to Psalm 77:68. The 'icon' overlooks the martyrs below dying for their adherence to the Lord's commandments, so giving the impression that they were being killed for their unshaken faith in God's chosen place and in the image of the Incarnation it encloses. If this is seen as an allusion to the persecution of iconophiles by iconoclast emperors, it complements the allusion of folio 78v opposite, which shows the Orthodox Church being held captive by the Babylonian heresy of iconoclasm. While on folio 78v the chosen people of God are suffering at the hands of an iniquitous king for their own impiety – symbolized by the adoration of the demon on top of the page; on folio 79r they suffer under the sceptre of a tyrant for their piety – manifested in the icon-like Virgin and Child. Thus the two folios give a complete picture of the calamity of iconoclasm as it was understood by iconophile circles: a God-sent punishment for the sins of the New Israel, throwing Christians into bondage to evil powers; and a test that forced the true chosen people of God to stand up for their religious tradition and regain their moral standards by defending their faith against iconoclast persecution.³⁸⁴ The auspicious end of this ordeal is manifested through Christ's Resurrection, depicted in the middle between the Jewish captivity to the Babylonians and the martyrdom of the Maccabees. Faith in the Incarnated Logos and his triumph over death, manifested through both word and image, will lead to the final salvation of Christians from heretic captivity and will reward martyrs with the prize of eternal life.³⁸⁵

As well as this 'horizontal' reading of cross-references between the miniatures of folios 78v-79r, a 'vertical' reading is also possible. In the first three scenes the Old Israel appears iniquitous and idolatrous, and so punished by God with subjection to its enemies. The next miniatures present the Incarnation of the Logos and his triumph over death, events that brought redemption to humanity and created the New Israel of Christian believers. The replacement of the Old Covenant by the New is emphasized by juxtaposing an Old Testament type of the Incarnation, David's anointment, with its New Testament fulfilment, made visible in the image of the Virgin and Child. In the final composition, the true chosen people of God manifest their unshaken faith in the

³⁸⁴ In addition to the texts mentioned on p. 105, n. 335 above, see also Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 250 (epistle 133:2-10), 298 (176:23-24), 819 (542:37-40).

³⁸⁵ Cf. Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 510 (epistle 379:11-14).

Lord, preferring to die rather than abandon their religious tradition: under the veil of biblical typology, the iconophiles, worthy descendants of the Maccabees, appear as martyrs tortured by order of iconoclast emperors in the wake of the iniquitous Antiochos.

Such a reading complements Corrigan's interpretation, according to which the miniatures of Psalm 77 signify the replacement of the Old Covenant with the New.³⁸⁶ This more complex reading and interpretation of the martyrdom of the Maccabees renders the meaning of the whole opening on folios 78v-79r much more iconophile in tone. The superiority of the New Israel over the Old is explained by a multiplicity of references – steadfast adherence to God's command, faith in the Incarnation as foretold by the prophets, fulfilled through the Virgin and finally celebrated in icons, the veneration of which is defended by the Maccabean iconophiles.

The purpose of this chapter has been to validate the typological approach to the Old Testament miniatures of ninth-century marginal psalters, interpreted as allusions to the iconophile-iconoclast conflict on the basis of their iconographic and compositional characteristics, and their relation to relevant references of iconophile texts. The aim was not to exhaust the subject but to give convincing examples of such a typological reading, in order to enrich our understanding of the complex and sophisticated iconophile references present in the illustration of these codices. More examples of this typological approach, combined with a Christological analysis of theological import, will be given in chapter III on the New Testament imagery of the manuscripts.

³⁸⁶ Corrigan (1992), 50-52.

Chapter three

New Testament Scenes

A large number of the miniatures in the ninth-century marginal psalters represent New Testament events, most of which include Christ. There are scenes related to Christ's birth and infancy, his baptism, miracles and teaching, his passion, resurrection and ascension, often repeated in different versions across the pages.³⁸⁷ The depiction of Christ in these miniatures is a vehement iconophile statement *per se*, a practical declaration of the venerability and validity of Jesus' images.³⁸⁸ The fact that such images are illustrating the text of the psalms (Old Testament) and not a gospel (New Testament) gives additional iconophile significance: they visualize the Christological content of the psalm text by marking out verses understood as prophecies about Christ's life on earth. Their iconophile argument, as mentioned previously, is that if the Old Testament prophets saw the Lord in their iconic visions, then following his New Testament Incarnation true icons venerated by the Church could and should make Christ visible to all.³⁸⁹ This is expressed more clearly in those miniatures that include the figure of a prophet, usually David, pointing towards the event depicted as if to validate the Christological interpretation of the psalm verse (figs 40, 99, 102, 125-28, 142, 153, 194, 196).³⁹⁰ Such images recall a passage from the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council mentioning the admonition of St Athanasios in his *Epistola ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum* to "venerate the prophecies about the Saviour" contained in the psalter. Following this citation the participants of the council commented that "If it is pious to venerate them (i.e. the Christological psalm prophecies), how much more is it necessary for us to venerate what is the fulfilment of the prophetic reflection that we see in an icon?"³⁹¹

³⁸⁷ See Walter (1986).

³⁸⁸ Brubaker (1989a), 39.

³⁸⁹ See pp. 40, 51-52 above.

³⁹⁰ Corrigan (1992), 62 ff.

³⁹¹ *Mansi* XIII, 363E-364A.

This passage underlines the iconophile significance of the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters with an extensive cycle of New Testament miniatures visualizing the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning Christ.

In a sense therefore, every image of Christ in the ninth-century marginal psalters is iconophile in intent; but over and above this general reference, closer analysis reveals iconophile evocations in the details of every miniature. This chapter examines illustrations of Christ's miracles and teaching in section 1, and of his Resurrection in section 2, in order to show their theological and typological references in the light of Christian literature, and especially the iconophile polemics of the time.

III.1 Christ's miracles and teaching

Among the miracles shown in the ninth-century marginal psalters are the multiplication of the loaves and fishes,³⁹² the calming of the wind and sea on lake Tiberiad,³⁹³ the expulsion of a legion of demons from the man from Gerasos,³⁹⁴ various scenes of healing,³⁹⁵ and the Raising of Lazarus.³⁹⁶ Christ is also shown absolving certain sinners, such as Zacchaeus and the prostitute,³⁹⁷ or the Samaritan woman,³⁹⁸ who were converted through Christ's divine intervention. Early Christian and Byzantine theology held that when the Incarnate Logos performed a supernatural or redemptive act, he used his human nature (his voice, his body, his touch etc.) as a vehicle through which his divine nature could be gloriously manifested for the salvation of mankind and its conversion to the true faith.³⁹⁹ In other words, in his

³⁹² Chludov Psalter, folio 30r.

³⁹³ Chludov Psalter, folio 88r.

³⁹⁴ Chludov Psalter, folio 65r.

³⁹⁵ Chludov Psalter, folios 101v, 84v (healing of the woman in haemorrhage); Pantokrator Psalter, folio 144r; Paris marginal Psalter, 9v.

³⁹⁶ Pantokrator Psalter, folio 29r.

³⁹⁷ Chludov Psalter, folio 84v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 118r.

³⁹⁸ Chludov Psalter, folio 33r; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 42v.

³⁹⁹ For example, Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 760A, *Mansi* V, 117E, 300C; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 264A-C, 429D, 432AB, 433D, 485C-E, 537DE, 708CD; Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui spatio (Sermones)*, ed. Heil *et alii* (1967), 292:6-22; Cyril of Jerusalem, *In paralyticum*, PG 33, 1141A; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 42, 668A; Paul of Emesa, *Homilia II*, PG 77, 1441C; John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 82-83 (I.8/III.8:65-70), *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 146/151 (59,III.15:37-49/177-82), 161 (63,III.19:20-32), *De duabus voluntatibus*, PG 95, 181CD; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 175 (epistle 133:40-48), *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI.1, 126 (question 319:9-14).

teaching and especially his miracles Christ gave incontestable proof of his two undivided and unconfused natures, united in one hypostasis. This means that pictorial depictions of his miraculous and redemptive deeds not only convey this basic dogma of Orthodox belief, but also demonstrate the ability of icons to relate to it and teach it to the faithful.

In other words, such imagery refutes the iconoclast charge that icons are incompatible with Orthodoxy because they divide Christ's two natures by depicting only the human, visible one and omitting the divine, invisible one. Moreover, the iconoclasts argued that if icons do not cause this heretical division, they do represent both the human and divine nature of Jesus, and this is heretical in itself by being a violation of the Orthodox dogma that divinity is invisible and uncontainable, and so cannot be circumscribed and represented in images.⁴⁰⁰ In reply to these accusations the iconophiles pointed out that dividing the divine nature of Christ from his human one, or depicting both when showing him in icons, is as impossible and illogical as saying that when a man's body is painted in a picture, it is either divided from his soul, or both body and soul are shown in the image.⁴⁰¹ Iconophiles also protested that the iconoclastic argumentation can cause other major heretic distortions of the Christological dogma. For example, to claim that when Christ's human nature is painted his divine one is also represented, leads by analogy to the heretic conclusion that when Christ's body was suffering on the cross his divinity was suffering likewise.⁴⁰² For the supporters of icon veneration, holy images fully respect the dogma of Christ's two natures in one hypostasis by attributing to each nature the characteristics proper to it.⁴⁰³ The human nature is shown as visible and circumscribable, while the divine remains invisible but still united with the human, manifesting itself through the supernatural acts it performs through the medium of

⁴⁰⁰ For these iconoclast claims (and their iconophile refutation) see, for example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 72BC, 241-61, 340-44; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 216-328, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 81 (§37) ff. Also Brubaker (1988-89), 35; Corrigan (1992), 69; Giakalis (1994), 93-113; Parry (1996), 99-113.

⁴⁰¹ For example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 244B, 261AB, 340E, 345AB; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 276A, 285BC.

⁴⁰² For example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 253DE; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 241D, 284D-285A, 328CD, *Antirrheticus II*, PG 100, 332AB, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 781CD.

⁴⁰³ See the texts in note 400 above, and Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 332BC, 349BC, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 99, 400CD-401A.

Christ's human body.⁴⁰⁴ This iconophile argument is a reason for depicting Christ's miracles, where the supernatural powers of his divine nature are made visible through his human actions. In a sense, therefore, every time a miracle is shown in the ninth-century marginal psalters, the viewer might recall this polemic. It is worth noting that a similar interpretation has been proposed for some miracle illustrations in cod. Paris. gr. 510. Der Nersessian has argued that the miracles shown on folios 196v, 310v and 316r were meant to emphasize the Incarnation of the Logos and Christ's two natures, a dogma mentioned in the relevant homilies but without specific reference to these miracles.⁴⁰⁵

Another feature of some miracle and teaching scenes is their emphasis on specific human attributes of Christ, like his human emotions and experiences, his bodily circumscription in time and space, the fact that he could be seen and touched by others, become tired or fall asleep, feel hunger, thirst, fear, anger, pain etc. Since all these characteristics prove beyond doubt the reality of the Incarnation of the Logos in Jesus (and for this reason they are repeatedly cited in Christian literature),⁴⁰⁶ they

⁴⁰⁴ That images of Christ's miracles manifest his divine nature is most explicitly stated by John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 72 (II.6/III.3:4-5), 82-83 (I.8/III.8:65-70); 94 (I.18:6-14), 123 (III.12:15-23), John says that images of Christ's passions and miracles attest to the Incarnation of the Logos; in the latter excerpt he claims that holy icons showing Christ's human nature commemorate also the glory of his divine nature (although it is not depicted, as invisible; a similar statement is found in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 188CD; and by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 256B). That Christ's divine nature was manifested through his miracles (while his human through his passion) is stated, for example, by John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 216 (91.IV.18:116-18); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 340DE; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 188B, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 252A-C, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 585CD, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 38 (§17:18-40). This idea was commonplace in Christian literature. Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 588A, 608B-D, 745D-749E, *Mansi* V, 225A; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VII, 469A, 652B; Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 377B, 540DE, 541, 560AB; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 220E, 265A, 340E, 425A, 437AB; Theophilos of Alexandria, *Fragmenta graeca*, PG 65, 56B, 60AB; Proclus of Constantinople, *In Mariam*, PG 65, 692A; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), II, 213-14 (epistle 265:76-83), III, 19 (284:544-553).

⁴⁰⁵ Der Nersessian (1962), 204-205; Brubaker (1999), 82, 270.

⁴⁰⁶ Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 645B, 897 BC, 1416AB, *Mansi* V, 108E, 132A-C, 173A-E 225A, 300DE; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VI, 965B, *Mansi* VII, 652B; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 265C, 376C-377C, 405A-C, 425BD, 428E, 437AB, 484C-E, 704C, 708B; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 170-73 (X.2,4-2,5), 215-221 (XIII.2-XIII.3), 236-247 (XIII.7-XIII.8), 256-57 (XIV), 317-18 (XXIV:69-75). Examples by iconophile writers: John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 152 (59, III.15:226-29), 159 (62, III.18:44-46), 162-63 (64, III.20:3-4/26-27), 171 (72, III.28:2-11); Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrhetici I-III*, PG 100, 272BC, 373A, 460A/D, 461C-464B, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 282 (§ 177:1-4), 289 (§ 182:23-35); Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 449D, 452B, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 344 (epistle 221:60-68), 493 (359:2-26), 536 (386:41-49), 615 (437:21-28); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 9-10/12-13 (epistle 1:246-63/335-357), 175 (133:40-48), III, 19/70-72 (284:549-50/2337-2380). Also, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1143A, *Mansi* XIII, 172D. For references to

act also as an iconophile discourse – the Incarnation being the principal iconophile argument in support of Christ’s depiction in images. Thus all the Christological episodes depicted in the ninth-century marginal psalters can be related in one way or another to iconophile arguments concerning the Incarnation and the unconfused and undivided hypostatic union of Christ’s two natures. Events like the Nativity, the Baptism, the Transfiguration, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection and the Ascension can be considered miraculous and thus emphatic of Christ’s divinity, while at the same time indicative also of his perfect humanity. However, the miracles studied in this chapter concern the victorious confrontation of Jesus with sin, demons, disease, and natural elements. These manifest Christ’s divinity while he acted on earth with his human nature, but also contain the element of conflict between the powers of good and evil, light and darkness, which can be interpreted typologically as a reference to the conflict between iconophiles and iconoclasts.

All three miniatures chosen for analysis in this section come from the Chludov Psalter, which in comparison to the other two marginal psalters preserves more numerous and more complex illustrations. The order in which they are examined is once more dictated by their compositional sophistication. The single scene of Christ calming the wind and sea (Psalm 88:10) is followed by three interrelated miniatures, one of which shows Christ performing an exorcism (Psalm 67:31), and finally by three separate gospel episodes presenting Jesus as healer and redeemer all in one composition (Psalm 84:3).⁴⁰⁷

Psalm 88: Christ calming the wind and sea
(*Chludov Psalter, folio 88r*)

On folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter is one of the largest miniatures of the codex dedicated to a single event (fig. 106). Illustrating Psalm 88:10 “Thou rulest the power of the sea; and thou calmest the tumult of its waves”, Christ is shown rebuking the wind and the waters on lake Tiberiad (*Matthew* 8:23-27, *Mark* 4:36-41, *Luke* 8:22-25). In a small boat in a rough sea Christ’s disciples, with Peter leading them, implore

Christ falling asleep and being tangible (with mention of other human attributes as well) see pp. 126 (notes 418-19), 152 (n. 533) below.

⁴⁰⁷ These three miniatures were also presented in the First Meeting of the Byzantinologists of Greece and Cyprus (abstract in Evangelatou [1999]).

their master to calm the tempest putting their lives in jeopardy. Jesus is depicted raising his right hand in the gesture of speech, performing the miracle referred to by the inscription: *KINAYNEYONTOC TOY IIAΩ EIIITIMΩN O IC TΩ ANEMΩ KAI TH ΘAAAACCH* (as the sailing was becoming dangerous, Jesus rebuking the wind and the sea). Personifications of these two natural elements, inscribed *ANEMOC* (wind) and *ΘAAAACCA* (sea) are represented as they submit to the Lord's command. The Sea is depicted crouching, with her hands outstretched in sign of submission, and the Wind is rendered with his mute horn held downwards and his left hand sealing his mouth in "the gesture of silence".⁴⁰⁸ The relevant folio is missing from the Paris marginal Psalter,⁴⁰⁹ which initially might have contained a similar miniature. In the Pantokrator Psalter the folio (124) was mutilated when the Transfiguration on the verso was cut out, but since only the lateral margin is missing it is possible that the miracle, which is painted across the whole bottom margin in the Chludov and the Bristol Psalters, was not depicted at all in the Pantokrator Psalter. In any case there are no traces of it in the bottom margin.⁴¹⁰

This scene gives a clear example of the influence that psalm commentaries exerted on the illustration of Byzantine psalters. Psalm 88:10 was interpreted as a prophesy of the gospel episode in question by psalm commentators such as Athanasios of Alexandria and Didymos the Blind.⁴¹¹ It was also mentioned with the same significance in other texts, such as the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council,⁴¹² which shows that the association between the psalm and the miracle was known even beyond the scope of psalm commentaries (partly as a result of the Church Fathers' familiarity with psalter exegeses). It is possible, therefore, that the scene of Christ rebuking the wind and sea was included in pre-iconoclastic Byzantine psalters, and these may have been the source of the illustration of the Chludov Psalter. The eleventh-century Bristol Psalter does show this scene with Psalm 88:10,⁴¹³ and it has been argued that several of its miniatures go back to lost models before iconoclasm.⁴¹⁴ However, even if the miniature on folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter is based on an

⁴⁰⁸ See Grabar (1945), 126-28, for the significance of this gesture in Christian art: complete silence, avoidance of blasphemous and evil words that are contrary to the glorification of God.

⁴⁰⁹ Dufrenne (1966), 41.

⁴¹⁰ Anderson (1998), 312.

⁴¹¹ Walter (1986), 274, mentions only Didymos, *In psalmos*, PG 39, 1489 (ed. Mühlenberg [1975-78], II, 169, §885). See also Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 385C.

⁴¹² *Mansi* IV, 749D.

⁴¹³ Folio 147r, Dufrenne (1966), 63, pl. 56.

⁴¹⁴ See pp. 7 (n. 26), 45 (n. 75) above.

earlier model, we have to ask whether the interpretation of its meaning might be different. Did the ninth-century planner(s) of the Chludov Psalter choose a traditional image to put forward topical iconophile ideas?

The Christological significance of this miracle from an iconophile point of view is twofold. The obedience of the sea and wind to the will of Christ proves his divine nature. His divinity is communicated indirectly through the supernatural character of the event.⁴¹⁵ His human nature and bodily presence on earth, on the other hand, is shown directly. According to the gospel narrative, Jesus not only embarked on a boat (bodily circumscription in time and place)⁴¹⁶ but, more importantly, fell asleep during the voyage, giving a clear indication of his human nature as subject to fatigue.⁴¹⁷ It was during his sleep that the tempest broke out and the frightened disciples woke him up to ask for help. The miniature shows him already awake and performing the miracle, but the significance of his falling asleep would not escape the attention of Byzantine viewers. Christ's falling asleep was one of his most frequently cited human attributes mentioned as proof of the Incarnation of the Logos, not only in iconophile texts,⁴¹⁸ but in Early Christian and Byzantine theology generally.⁴¹⁹ Thus

⁴¹⁵ In Christian literature the miracle of the calming down of the wind and sea on lake Tiberiad was one of the most frequently mentioned wondrous acts of Christ proving his divine nature. For some random examples see the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 749D; Origen, *In Matthaeum*, PG 13, 980A; Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Iudaeos*, PG 46, 204B; Amphilochios of Iconium, *Opera*, Datema (1978), 225 (fragment II:48); Proclus of Constantinople, *Orationes*, PG 65, 695C, 777B; Cyril of Alexandria, *Homiliae paschales*, PG 77, 629D, 765D, 893C, 992D, 1064CD; Paul of Emesa, *Homiliae*, PG 77, 1441C; Leontios presbyter, *Homilies*, ed. Datema – Allen (1987), 233 (VI:111-113), 437 (XIV:117-118); John of Damascus, *Laudatio S. Barbarae*, PG 96, 805A; Patriarch Photios, *Sermo I adversus Manichaeos* and *Confutatio Agareni*, PG 104, 1325B / 1417C respectively, *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-1988), V, 138 (question 129:3-4); Euthymios Zigabenos, *In psalmos* PG 128, 1064C, 1065B (Psalm 106:23/29), *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, PG 129, 296D, 496A.

⁴¹⁶ The embarkation of Christ on the boat is considered as proof of his human nature, for example, by Gregory Nazianzenus, *Theological discourses*, SC 318, 272 (37, 2:8), and Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 42, 668A. In a homily under the name of John Chrysostom (*In crucem, spuria*), PG 50, 818, the author mentions twice that Jesus sailed and once more that he sat on a boat, as proof of his humanity. Euthymios Zigabenos, *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, PG 129, 296D, also says that Christ's using a boat to reach his destination was an indication of his human nature.

⁴¹⁷ *Matthew* 8:24, *Mark* 4:38, *Luke* 8:23.

⁴¹⁸ Or other texts written by militant iconophiles (where his falling asleep is mentioned together with other of Christ's human attributes). For some examples see John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, Kotter (1973), 165 (67, III.23:11), 215 (91, V.18:82), *De recta sententia*, PG 94, 1428C, *In Pauli epistolas*, PG 95, 733D, *Barlaam et Joasaph*, PG 96, 1029B, *Disputatio Saraceni et Christiani*, PG 96, 1345A; Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 333A, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 445B, 452B; Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-1985), I, 165 (epistle 127:13), II, 138 (228:7).

⁴¹⁹ Christ's falling asleep, recorded only by the Gospel episode under discussion, is one of the most frequently used arguments in support of his human nature, both in homilies and dogmatic discourses. Examples of such references (accompanied by other of Christ's human attributes) in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* V, 104C, 173BC, 429A; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 377AB, 405AB, 484E; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 42, 680B, 816A, 852B; Amphilochios of Iconium, *Opera*, Datema (1978), 225 (fragment II:47-48); John Chrysostom, *In illud Pater si possibile*,

the calming of the sea and wind represented on folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter makes emphatic reference both to Christ's human nature, and to the manifestation of his divinity by depicting him performing a supernatural act. The scene is a clear refutation of the iconoclast accusation about the division of Christ's two natures when his humanity is depicted in icons and his divinity, being invisible, is not.

Showing Christ awake and performing his miracle, rather than asleep (an episode that also appear in representations of the calming down of the tempest in Byzantine art, fig. 107),⁴²⁰ can be understood as a choice which puts emphasis on his divine nature, in accordance with the wording of the relevant psalm verse, "Thou rulest the power of the sea; and thou calmest the tumult of its waves." Another layer of meaning with iconophile significance lies in the typological connotations of the scene. In the literary tradition of Byzantium, and especially in iconophile writings, sin, temptation, and above all heresy are frequently compared to a sea-storm, a tempest, demonic winds or waves, and piety and Orthodoxy to a secure and serene harbour where the ship of Christ's Church can anchor safely.⁴²¹ Heretics are said to be

PG 51, 37-38; Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistulae*, PG 77, 236AB, *De Trinitate*, PG 77, 1156A; Sophronios of Jerusalem, *Epistola synodica ad Sergium CP*, PG 87, 3173B; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 219 (XIII,3:53), 227 (XIII,5:75), 236-239 (XIII,7:7/24/68/88), 244/247 (XIII,8:39/127); Euthymios Zigabenos, *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, PG 129, 296D.

⁴²⁰ For example, on folios 70r and 120v of cod. Laur. VI. 23 (Four Gospels, eleventh century), Christ is shown twice in the same boat, first sleeping and then rebuking the wind and sea, illustrating the relevant episodes in *Mark* 4:36-31 and *Luke* 8:22-25 (Velmans [1971], 35, 42, figs 139, 208). Likewise in an mosaic of the north transept in St Marco, Venice (fig. 107). The scene is dated at the beginning of the twelfth century and thought to have as iconographic model the miniatures of a contemporary Byzantine manuscript (Demus [1984], Text I, 115, 120, Plates I, fig. 143; Bertoli [1986], 180, fig. 85)

⁴²¹ (Cf. *Ephesians* 4:14 "Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming", and *James* 1:6 "... he who doubts is like a wave of the sea, blown and tossed by the wind", passages that are sometimes quoted in anti-heretic polemics). Examples of the above and relevant expressions in iconophile texts: John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 65 (I.1:7-13), 143 (III.41:42-44); Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 209BC, 217B, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 533B, 544B, 569D, 593D-569A, 804AB, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 50 (§23:54-55), 51 (§24:25-26), 69 (§31:33-34), 295 (§185:49-50); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 198 (epistle 77:11-13), 203 (82:21-240, 211 (90:18-19), 214 (93:8-15), 283 (162:16), 350 (222:34-36), 351 (223:13-14), 402 (272:24-25), 405 (274:5-7), 411 (276:71-73), 471 (330:10-12), 478-79 (338:4-7), 557 (401:20-22/27-28), 741 (501:16-18), 753 (507:5-6), 858 (559:2-5); *Letter of the Three Patriarchs and Pseudo-Damascenos, Letter to Theophilus*, ed. Munitiz *et alii* (1997), 77 (§ 13.c), 155 (§ 7.c) respectively; *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 41C, 44A, 49D, 53AB, 61B, 69B-D, 76B, 81CD, 89C, 117BC, 124B, 144D, 156D; *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 74 (§11:4), 84 (§18:178-79); *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 169B, 309C; *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 884B. Some examples in other texts: Acts of the following ecumenical councils: the second, *Mansi* III, 548BC; the third, *Mansi* IV, 1389AB; the fourth, *Mansi* VII, 316C, 317D; the fifth, *Mansi* IX, 409D; the sixth, *Mansi* XI, 461C, 464A. Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 449D, 653D, 857C, PG 42, 245C, 333A, 773C-776A, 777A; John Chrysostom (*spuria*), PG 52, 776 (*In ascensionem*), 807 (*In pentecosten I*), 833-34 (*In memoriam martyrum*), PG 55, 539 (*In psalmum IV*), 669-70 (*In psalmum CVI*), PG 59, 654 (*In Chananaeam*), 671 (*In principium indictionis*),

wrecked and their faith is compared to a sinking boat, while the pious and Orthodox Christians sailing in the sea of life face the tempest of temptations and heresy like courageous captains and save the boat of their soul.⁴²² When the ship of the Church is endangered by heretic tempests, the Church Fathers implore God for help in order to overcome the peril,⁴²³ usually making reference exactly to the miracle depicted on folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter, where the wind and sea were calmed by Christ's intervention. They ask Jesus to perform the miracle once more, this time rebuking and silencing not the natural elements that have frightened his disciples, but the heretic storm that threatens his Church.⁴²⁴ When heresy is finally overcome, the event is celebrated with expressions that make reference to the same miracle.⁴²⁵

The typological use of this miracle was so widespread in Byzantine culture that at times the gospel episode itself was interpreted as signifying the salvation of God's chosen people, the defeat of the devil, of temptation and ignorance (all cases that can be generally related to the menace of heresy). So Origen, commenting on *Song of songs* 4:16, mentions the miracle of the calming the tempest and compares the rebuking of the wind to expelling the devil from a soul preparing herself to accept the Lord.⁴²⁶ In the *Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis* in Jerusalem (a twelfth-century codex recording texts of an earlier period), an ode sung during the celebration of the

PG 64, 21-22 (*Quod mari similes sit haec vita*); Michael Synkellos, *Vita Dionysii Areopagitae*, PG 4, 644C-645A.

⁴²² (Cf. I *Timothy* 1:19 "some have...shipwrecked their faith" – sometimes quoted in anti-heretic polemics). Examples of iconophile texts: Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 376A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 65 (§ 29:58-59), 72 (§ 32:23-24); Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 453C, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 211 (epistle 90:19), 214 (93:8-14), 273 (153:21), 309 (186:33-34), 388 (259:10-15), 407 (275:42). Examples in other texts: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi V*, 377BC, 440A-D; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XI*, 733E; John Chrysostom (*spuria*), *In crucem*, PG 50, (817-818); Proclus of Constantinople, *De incarnatione*, PG 65, 693A.

⁴²³ Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi IV*, 1041A; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XI*, 464C; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 653BC; Patriarch Germanos, *De heresibus et synodis*, PG 98, 80C; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 504 (epistle 372:14-15); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 85-86 (§ 14:4-15).

⁴²⁴ Examples in iconophile texts: Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 249 (epistle 132:10-12), 297-98 (176:22-25), 411 (276:78-81), 458 (314:31-33), 464 (321:11-14/17-18/24-25), 474 (333:22-25), 503 (371:27-30), 819 (542:37-40), 829 (547:52-56) [and 93, (33:48-55), concerning not iconoclasm but the second marriage of Constantine VI]; *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1248B. Examples in other texts: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi IV*, 1057B, *Mansi V*, 181A-C; Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1264C-1265B (Psalm 103:25); Basil of Seleukia, *Orationes*, PG 85, 265AB.

⁴²⁵ Examples in iconophile texts: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XII*, 1122B; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 79 (§ 36:13-42). Examples in other texts: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi V*, 352E; John of Constantinople, *Epistola ad Constantium papam*, PG 96, 1428D-1429A.

⁴²⁶ *In canticum canticorum*, PG 13, 204D.

Entry into Jerusalem states that by rebuking the tempest Christ has saved his chosen people.⁴²⁷ In his *Enarratio in evangelium Matthaei*, the eleventh-century bishop of Ochrid, Theophylaktos, mentions in relation to the miracle the defeat of temptations and adds that Christ first calmed the tempest in his disciples' souls and then rebuked the sea.⁴²⁸ Commenting on a similar miracle – the night when Christ walked on the water towards the boat of his disciples, again calming a tempest that was troubling them (*Matthew* 14:23-33) – Theophylaktos once more sees the episode as an incident when Christ was teaching the apostles to face temptation.⁴²⁹ He also compares the circumstances of the event to a life troubled by evil spirits, with waves rising against the boat of the earth, and to the night of ignorance from which the Lord saves his people by calming the tempest.⁴³⁰ Likewise, Origen saw this miracle as one of Christ's lessons to his disciples and to all Christians to fight against temptations with the Lord's help.⁴³¹ In his *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, the twelfth-century writer Euthymios Zigabenos suggests that the miracle of the calming down of the wind and sea (*Matthew* 8:23-27) was set up and performed by Christ in order to teach his disciples to face temptation, so that they would become capable captains of the *ecumene*.⁴³²

Psalm 88:10 was interpreted in a similar typological and tropological way: Didymos sees the calming of the sea and its waves at God's command as the subjugation of temptation and passion;⁴³³ for Theodoret it is the punishment of the teachers of arrogance,⁴³⁴ and for Eusebios the defeat of evil spirits.⁴³⁵

The metaphor of the endangered ship and the threatening storm is extensively used in Byzantine literature in order to signify a perilous situation, not confined to the conditions of the Church but ranging from personal circumstances to affairs of state.⁴³⁶ The Byzantine metaphorical use of a ship in a storm was not only part of the literary tradition, its roots going back to classical and biblical texts, but also an

⁴²⁷ Ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), II, 7:29-8:2.

⁴²⁸ PG 123, 224AB.

⁴²⁹ PG 123, 300D.

⁴³⁰ PG 123, 304A.

⁴³¹ *In Matthaeum*, PG 13, 916C, 920A-924A.

⁴³² PG 129, 296C.

⁴³³ *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 169 (§885).

⁴³⁴ *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1581AB.

⁴³⁵ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 1088A-D.

⁴³⁶ Kazhdan – Franklin (1984), 263-266; Galatariotou (1993), 131.

everyday life experience at a time when travelling by sea involved great risks.⁴³⁷ Against this background it is very likely that calming the wind and sea as shown on folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter was typologically conceived and understood as an allusion to the defeat of iconoclasm and the salvation of the Church from the heretic tempest, thanks to the aid and protection Christ himself had given to his chosen people. Among the apposite references in iconophile literature it is worth noting in particular those of Theodore the Studite. In nine of his epistles written before the end of Iconoclasm, this militant iconophile implores Christ to (or expresses the hope that he will) finally rebuke the sea and the winds of heresy as he once did with the natural elements, and reinstate peace in his Church.⁴³⁸

There is an iconographic detail in the Chludov miniature that further supports this typological interpretation. The personification of the wind making “the gesture of silence”, is exactly like the man depicted on folio 30r (fig. 108), illustrating Psalm 33:14-15: “Keep your tongue from evil and your lips from speaking deceit; turn away from evil and practice good; seek peace and keep after it”. Both figures keep their mouths closed with one hand, demonstrating what a heretic (but also an Orthodox believer) should do: avoid deceitful and blasphemous words.⁴³⁹ It is significant that Patriarch Nikephoros in his *Refutatio et eversio* employs Psalm 33:14 to exhort the iconoclasts to stop talking heresy.⁴⁴⁰ In the same way he uses Psalm 72:8-9, “They have uttered unrighteousness loftily. They have set their mouth against heaven, and their tongue has gone through upon the earth”,⁴⁴¹ which on folio 70v of the Chludov Psalter is illustrated with the monstrous figures of two blasphemers (fig. 109): men with their upper jaws reaching the segment of heaven above them, and their unnaturally long tongues touching the ground.⁴⁴² An inscription identifies them as “the heretics who speak against God” (*OI AIPETIZONTEC KAI AAOYNTEC KATA TOY ΘΥ*).⁴⁴³ Their punishment is shown in another miniature of the Chludov Psalter, on folio 10v (fig. 110), illustrating verses 11:3-5: “Every one has spoken vanity to his

⁴³⁷ Kazhdan – Franklin (1984), 263; Galatariotou (1993), esp. 226.

⁴³⁸ See note 424 above (and notes 421-23 for other expressions in Theodore’s epistles relating iconoclasm to a tempest).

⁴³⁹ Mentioned also by Corrigan (1992), 122.

⁴⁴⁰ Ed. Featherstone (1997), 132 (§ 77:70-71).

⁴⁴¹ *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 42 (§ 19:47-50).

⁴⁴² Mentioned also by Corrigan (1992), 122.

⁴⁴³ Psalm 72:8 is also cited as a characterisation of heretics in the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 940A, in the first canon, which is also included in the *Syntagma canonum* of Patriarch Photios, PG 104, 448B.

neighbour: their lips are deceitful, they have spoken with a double heart. Let the Lord destroy all the deceitful lips, and the tongue that speaks great words: who have said, We will magnify our tongue; our lips are our own: who is Lord of us?" An angel is shown pulling out with pincers the tongue of a man who has fallen to the ground with his arms tied behind his back. The inscription reads "He blasphemes against the holy Church of God" (*ΒΛΑCΦΗΜΕΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗC ΑΓΙΑC ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑC*).⁴⁴⁴ Once more, it is to be noted that Psalm 11:3-4 is used in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council to condemn the iconoclasts for their irreverent and heretic pronouncements.⁴⁴⁵

The blasphemous heretics of folios 10v and 70v that would not refrain from speaking deceit, and the silenced personification of the wind on folio 88r also reflect a characteristic statement by the participants at the Seventh Ecumenical Council, who accuse iconoclasts of being "more insensitive than inanimate creation and more irrational than irrational beings", which acknowledge their creator and follow his commandments, contrary to heretics.⁴⁴⁶ The comparison between impious iconoclasts and obedient creation follows a well-established tradition in Christian literature, where it is commonplace to accuse the Jews that crucified Christ of having been more insensitive than the entire creation which expressed her grief over the Lord's Passion with supernatural meteorological and other phenomena.⁴⁴⁷ Since the iconophiles

⁴⁴⁴ The inscription is overwritten (the letters are not the same as in the original ninth-century inscriptions – cf. fig. 109). Before the verb *ΒΛΑCΦΗΜΕΙ* can be seen two letters, probably *ΚΦ* (Ščepkina records an *H*); maybe they are an abbreviation for *ΚΥΡΙΟC ΦΗCΙΝ* ("The Lord says").

⁴⁴⁵ *Mansi* XIII, 221A, 228D (trans. Sahas [1986], 61, 66). Also mentioned by Corrigan (1992), 122, n. 81. Psalm 11:3 is also used in the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, ed. Munitiz *et alii* (1997), 67:13-14, 69:3 (§ 10.h), referring to the iconoclast Theodore of Syracuse. It is also employed by Patriarch Photios to condemn a schismatic abbot, as well as heretics and impious men in general, *Epistulae*, Laourdas – Westerink (1983-1985), I, 67 (epistle 15:17), III, 17 (284:474-475). Likewise, it is quoted as referring to the impiety of heretics in Photios' *Bibliotheca*, Henry (1959-1977), IV, 158:42-43 (number 229, also PG 103, 1005B).

⁴⁴⁶ *Mansi* XIII, 212CD; cf. 96C (the whole creation, the sky, the earth, the sea, the animals and the plants would use words and images if they could to praise the Incarnation that the iconoclasts deny with their opposition to icons; from a letter of Pope Gregory to Patriarch Germanos). Cf. Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1248BC, where Nestorios denying the divinity of Christ is considered more irrational than the sea that calmed her waves at Christ's order, and death that gave Lazarus back to life. The darkened sun, the opened graves, the destroyed Temple veil are also mentioned as signs of the creation's empathy to the suffering of the Incarnated Logos, and are contrasted with Nestorios' insensitivity.

⁴⁴⁷ For example, John Chrysostom (*spuria*), *In cruce*, PG 50, 823-24; Proclus of Constantinople, *In resurrectionem*, PG 65, 788D-789A; Patriarch Photios, *Homilies*, ed. Laourdas (1959), 107:30-108:2 (homily XI,3), 124:31-125:10 (XII,5-6); trans. Mango (1958), 196, 215-16. Other references to the empathy of the creation during the Crucifixion (with no mention of the Jews): John Chrysostom, (*spuria*), *In ascensionem* III, PG 52, 797, *In pascha* VI, PG 59, 744; Proclus of Constantinople, PG 65, 785B (*In dominicam passionem*), 789D (*In sanctum pascha*); Michael Synkellos, *Vita Dionysii Areopagitae*, PG 4, 625D-628A.

perceived the destruction of Christ's icons as a second Passion,⁴⁴⁸ they sometimes claimed that the creation during the iconoclast period repeatedly demonstrated her abhorrence of this heresy by supernatural phenomena, which occasionally they compare to those that had occurred during the Crucifixion – so showing that iconoclasts were “more insensitive than inanimate creation”. This kind of thinking surfaces frequently in the writings by Patriarch Nikephoros.⁴⁴⁹ It is also seen in a passage from the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, quoting Athanasios speaking of the Jews having “crucified” an icon of Christ, when the sun and moon were once again darkened and shaken as in the Passion.⁴⁵⁰

Miraculous phenomena during the Passion are illustrated in two miniatures of the Crucifixion in the Chludov Psalter, where the sun and moon are depicted flanking the dead Jesus on the cross (folios 45v, 72v, figs 210, 66). As Corrigan has observed, this iconographic element serves “to testify to the real human death of Christ, the Son of God”.⁴⁵¹ This emphasis on the fact that the Logos actually became man is obviously a statement directed against iconoclasts who, according to iconophile reasoning, rejected the reality of the Incarnation by rejecting the representability of Christ in icons. I would suggest that the presence of the sun and moon in the Crucifixion scene has additional iconophile connotations, similar to those of the personifications of the wind and sea on folio 88r. By their empathy with or obedience to Christ, the natural elements in both cases emphasize the divinity of the Incarnated Logos, giving proof of the ability of icons to declare the Orthodox dogma of Christ's two natures in one hypostasis. By responding to the Saviour's suffering or command, the natural elements expose the blasphemy and impiety of iconoclasts, who not only refuse to respect the Lord's commandments (howling as the winds and waves of a

⁴⁴⁸ See p. 30, n. 23 above.

⁴⁴⁹ For the supernatural phenomena and the plagues that fell upon the Byzantine empire as God's punishment for the iconoclast iniquity (both in the works by Nikephoros and in other texts) see pp. 81-82, n. 229 above. Such phenomena are specifically explained as a result of the creation's empathy in Nikephoros' *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 496D, 497A, 497BC, 500B (the last two with reference to the Crucifixion), *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 572A, 580A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 50 (§ 23:48-49); and in Pseudo-Damascenos, *Letter to Theophilos*, ed. Munitiz et alii (1997), 171 (§ 14.c). Other cases in which it is implied that the iconoclasts are more insensitive than inanimate creation: Nikephoros writes that even the stones would recognize the truths that the iconoclasts refuse to acknowledge, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 640A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 52 (§ 24:44-46); Theodore the Studite speaks about an earthquake with many victims, and wonders how the iconoclasts could remain unmoved by such phenomena caused by their iniquity, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 249 (epistle 132:2-8).

⁴⁵⁰ *Mansi XIII*, 25A.

⁴⁵¹ Corrigan (1992), 85-87.

ferocious tempest), but cause the whole of creation to react violently and wondrously to the second Passion to which Christ is subjected by the destruction of his icons.

The personifications of the wind and sea on folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter allude indirectly to the insensitivity of iconoclasts in comparison to inanimate creation – especially if compared to the figures of the codex that refrain from speaking deceit or are being punished for their lack of it, as mentioned above (figs 108-10). More direct may be considered the allusion to the defeat of iconoclasm through the help of Christ who rebukes the demonic winds and waves of heresy as Theodore the Studite had entreated. If it is the case that the archaising Bristol Psalter gives the original illustration for Psalm 88:10 in the pre-iconoclastic tradition, then the Chludov Psalter has made a significant alteration to this tradition. In the Bristol Psalter the miracle is not yet completed (although the inscription mentions “Christ rebuking the sea”), since the personification of the Wind is blowing his horn towards the boat where Jesus is speaking to his disciples.⁴⁵² Unfortunately, the trimming of the page has caused the loss of the lower part of the miniature where the personification of the sea could be expected, judging by the reference of the inscription.⁴⁵³ We do not know, therefore, whether the Sea was shown as already submitting to Christ’s command or, like the Wind, still disobedient. It seems that in Byzantine art it was common to show the agitation of the two natural elements, like, for example, on folios 16r and 120v of the eleventh-century cod. Laur. VI. 23 where a personification of the sea in the first case and of the wind in the second are blowing a long trumpet towards Christ who is ordering them to silence.⁴⁵⁴ However in the Chludov Psalter both figures do indeed show their obedience to the will of Jesus. Such a change in the pictorial tradition effectively alludes to the victory of Orthodoxy over the heretic winds and waves of iconoclasm.

The miracle on folio 88r of the Chludov Psalter is a good example of the multiplicity of references that characterizes the Christological miniatures of the ninth-century marginal psalters using New Testament events to illustrate Old Testament texts. The resulting miniature is full of contemporary iconophile conceptions, both theological and typological. Iconographic details in the composition and similarities

⁴⁵² Folio 147r, Dufrenne (1966), 63, pl. 56 (Ι[ησοῦ]ς Χ[ριστός]ς ἐπιτιμῶν τῇ θαλάσσει).

⁴⁵³ For the trimming of the folios see Dufrenne (1966), 49.

⁴⁵⁴ Velmans (1971), 23, 42, figs 25, 208.

or cross-references with other illustrations of the whole manuscript cycle offer additional guidelines for deciphering the miniature's significance. The analysis that follows concerns an illustration that demonstrates even greater complexity and stratification of references, since in addition to all the elements already mentioned it inventively correlates various miniatures on the same folio.

Psalm 67: Christ exorcizing the demons
(*Chludov Psalter, folio 65r*)

Psalm 67:31 is illustrated on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter with one of Christ's miracles of exorcism (fig. 111). Its theological and typological allusions will be the main subject of the following analysis. However, its close visual interrelation with the other miniatures of the page – one of the most densely illustrated in the entire codex – suggests that in order to fully understand its message we must examine it not only by itself but also as part of the whole set.

The first verse of Psalm 67 to be illustrated on folio 65r is verse 28: "There is Benjamin, the youngest, ecstatic." The accompanying image is an icon. This is inscribed "Benjamin", but the portrait type is that of St Paul with his long brown beard and bald head, holding a codex. (In the relevant miniature on folio 85r of the Pantokrator Psalter a medallion with a similar figure is actually inscribed "Saint Paul" [*Ο ΑΓΙΟΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ*].)⁴⁵⁵ An explanation for this iconographic choice might be as follows: there is a rich tradition of psalm commentaries relating Psalm 67:28 to Paul, because he descended from the tribe of Benjamin (*Romans* 11:1, *Philippians* 3:5), was the last-summoned of the Apostles ("the youngest"), and had intense visionary experiences alluded to by the word "ecstatic" in the psalm.⁴⁵⁶ The artist has responded to these commentaries by choosing to show Benjamin in the form of St Paul. It must also be significant that he has used the format of an icon here.

Below the image of Benjamin is the miracle of the expulsion of the unclean spirits that possessed a man from Gerasos, according to *Mark* 5:1-20. This refers to Psalm 67:31, "Rebuke the wild beasts of the reed". Since certain psalm commentators

⁴⁵⁵ Dufrenne (1966), 27, pl. 11. Likewise on folio 106v of the Bristol Psalter, Dufrenne (1966), 60, pl. 53.

⁴⁵⁶ Origen, *In psalmos*, PG 12, 1509; Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 712; Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 301BC; Pseudo-Athanasios, *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 917; Cyril, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1156; Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1393.

identify the “wild beasts” with demons and the devil,⁴⁵⁷ it is not surprising that the artist illustrated their “rebuking” with a scene of exorcism.⁴⁵⁸ The two demons that have just left the Gerasene are shown above his head, running towards two swine at the top of the page; according to the gospel story, they will enter into them and make them rush over a precipice to drown in lake Tiberiad. The depiction of the demons and animals around St Paul’s icon will be discussed later as carrying various iconophile connotations.

Finally, Psalm 67: 32, “and Ethiopia will stretch out her hand to God” was commonly interpreted in the commentaries as a prophesy of Acts 8:26-40, narrating how Philip baptized the Ethiopian eunuch in the name of Christ.⁴⁵⁹ This episode is illustrated in the bottom margin of folio 65r. On the left the Apostle meets the eunuch seated on his chariot and reading the prophesies of Isaiah on his way home from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. After Philip has taught the man to understand the real meaning of the text and its fulfilment in the Incarnation and Passion of Jesus, the eunuch asks to be baptized in the name of Christ and this is represented on the bottom right of the folio. (The same scenes illustrate Psalm 67:32 on folio 85v of the Pantokrator Psalter, which does not contain any miniatures for verse 31 [fig. 112].⁴⁶⁰ The Paris marginal Psalter lacks Psalm 67 entirely.)⁴⁶¹

Taken separately, each one of these three miniatures illustrating Psalm 67 may be said to have iconophile connotations. The fact that it is an icon of Paul, depicted as a holy object glowing with its golden background and strongly marked off by a frame that illustrates verse 28 instead of a simple figure of the apostle against the bare white page, speaks for itself. This icon, which visualizes the Old Testament prophesy about Paul inscribed in the psalm, may be taken as another iconophile argument regarding images as justified because they show the fulfilment of the Old Testament. If David has foreseen Paul with the eyes of his mind in a kind of iconic vision, then the icon of

⁴⁵⁷ Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 713-16; Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 303A; Pseudo-Athanasios, *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 920; Cyril, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1157.

⁴⁵⁸ Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 679-81, and Pseudo-Athanasios, *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 912, relate verse 2 of Psalm 67 with this particular miracle of the exorcism of the Gerasene. The person who planned the miniature on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter may have been inspired by these commentaries, but he related the interpretation to a different verse (31), whose wording is even more fitting (“rebuke the wild beasts”, instead of “rise and let your enemies disperse” as in verse 2, illustrated in the Chludov Psalter with the Anastasis, -see below, p. 220).

⁴⁵⁹ Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 717; Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 303C; Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1160; Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1393.

⁴⁶⁰ Dufrenne (1966), 27, pl. 11.

⁴⁶¹ Dufrenne (1966), 41.

the apostle set next to the psalm text functions as a visionary image attesting to the fulfilment of the prophesy (and justified by it), manifesting the interrelation of the Old and the New Testament. This iconophile argument underlies also the representation of *Acts* 8:26-40 in the baptism scene of the Ethiopian: the psalmist foretold in verse 32 how this man learned about the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies on Christ's advent, as a consequence of which he gained his salvation by asking to be baptized.

The illustration of this episode in the Chludov Psalter emphatically declares that holy images are the visual consequence and proof of the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. By visually narrating what is textually recorded in the scriptures about Christ's Incarnation and his apostles, icons can lead men to the salvation of the Christian faith, exactly as the verbal interpretation of *Isaiah* by Philip led the Ethiopian eunuch to salvation. In other words, by emphasizing the role of icons as venerable and didactic visualizations of New Testament events and of the relation of the New dispensation with the Old, this miniature of the Chludov Psalter becomes a key for the justification and comprehension of the entire illumination of the manuscript with New Testament scenes. These scenes are the equivalent of Philip's explanation of the scriptures. They teach the viewer the deeper meaning of the psalm text concerning the Incarnation of the Logos. The fundamental iconophile belief that underlies this statement is the equal importance of holy texts and images for attaining knowledge of God and achieving salvation.⁴⁶²

The miracle of the exorcism of the Gerasene illustrated on the same folio is not solely an example of such New Testament images whose depiction is justified by the reasoning given above. Its iconophile connotations are manifold. The argument concerning the manifestation of Christ's divinity in pictorial representations of his miracles is particularly relevant in this case, since Christ in the exorcism of the Gerasene not only performed one of his most wondrous acts, expelling a legion of demons from the possessed man, but he was also recognized as "Son of the most high God" by the unclean spirits themselves (*Mark* 5:7). This miracle can be also related to a passage in the third *Antirrheticus* by Patriarch Nikephoros, who was replying to the iconoclast claim that icons should not be venerated because wherever Christ is shown together with the evil powers he defeated (like Hades in the scene of the Anastasis),

⁴⁶² For the equal, or even superior status of images in comparison to texts according to iconophile argumentation see Brubaker (1989a), 70-75; Corrigan (1992), 135-139; Giakalis (1994), 51-67; Brubaker (1999), 44, 46-49.

the veneration due to Jesus also passes to his abominable enemies. Nikephoros contends that such icons condemn evil as strongly as they exalt Christ's victory. He also observes with pointed irony that, according to this iconoclast argument, one should even reject the holy gospels for their mention of demons and other wicked figures that Jesus had to confront. The patriarch declares that the purpose of such gospel stories is to praise the Saviour for expelling the demons, and that the Orthodox Christians know whom they are venerating (*via* the icons).⁴⁶³ If the makers and users of the Chludov Psalter knew this passage, the illustration on folio 65r would certainly have reminded them of it.

The relationship between the miracle itself and the icon of St Paul on this page signals a further level of iconophile significance. The standard iconographic type of this specific exorcism in Byzantine art places the demons and the herd of swine – into which they enter after their expulsion from the man – at the feet of Christ and the Gerasene. Relevant depictions survive from the pre-iconoclastic period, the ninth century, and later (figs 114-16).⁴⁶⁴ It is particularly significant that the eleventh-century Theodore and Barberini Psalters, which had the Chludov Psalter as their indirect model, follow the standard iconography (fig. 113).⁴⁶⁵ In the Chludov Psalter, however, both the demons and the swine are depicted above the human protagonists; and by surrounding the icon of St Paul they make it seem to be almost part of the episode. This is hardly a coincidence to be explained by lack of space on the folio, for example. It is rather that the Chludov artist must have incorporated the icon into the miracle scene deliberately, and we can probably reconstruct the mental processes that led to this decision. In the psalm, verse 28 which relates to the icon comes before verse 31 which relates to the miracle. So the easiest way to illustrate these verses would have been to represent first the icon, at the top of the page where it would still be in close proximity to the relevant passage, and then the miracle scene below, where

⁴⁶³ PG 100, 436B-437A.

⁴⁶⁴ For example, the swine are represented below the Gerasene in an ivory plaque with miracles of Christ (fig. 114), dated in the fifth century and attributed to a workshop in Rome (*Age of Spirituality* [1979], 446-7, cat. no. 407). In the ninth century manuscript of the *Sacra Parallela* cod. Paris. gr. 923, folio 212v (fig. 115), possibly made in Constantinople, the swine and the demons are also represented below Christ and the Gerasene (Weitzmann [1979], fig. 447. For the possible Constantinopolitan origin of the manuscript see Cormack [1997], 146; Brubaker [1999], 25, n.29). On folios 16v and 70v of the Constantinopolitan cod. Laur. VI. 23 the swine are shown next to the exorcism scene (*Matthew* 8:28-34, *Mark* 5:6-10 respectively – in the first case the Gospel mentions two demonised in Gadara and not one in Gerasos; Velmans [1971], 23, 35, figs 26, 140). See also folio 156r (fig. 116) of the thirteenth-century cod. Iviron 5 (Mount Athos), Pelekanidis *et alii* (1975), 300, fig. 24.

⁴⁶⁵ Der Nersessian (1970), 37, fig. 138; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 97.

it could have been depicted independently as a separate miniature, following the standard iconography. In this way the sequence of the verses would be reflected in the sequence of the images. Instead, the artist chose to diverge from the standard iconography and insert the icon into the composition of the exorcism, as if the holy image was actually participating in the miracle that is evolving around it. By doing so he created a meaningful conceptual relationship between Paul's icon and Christ's miracle. Taken together they become an emphatic visualization of the iconophile assertion that holy images are not demonic objects as the iconoclasts claimed, but that on the contrary their miraculous power can help to drive demons away.⁴⁶⁶

On a more symbolic level, the confrontation between icon and defeated demons could refer to the iconophile victory over the demonic heresy of iconoclasm. This interpretation becomes more convincing in the light of the commonplace iconophile claim that iconoclasts were instruments of the devil and possessed or inspired by demons. Such accusations abound in iconophile literature – in line with a long tradition of Christian texts that name the devil and his legions as the instigators of disorder, sin and heresy.⁴⁶⁷ The same accusations are given visualization in another five miniatures of the Chludov and two of the Pantokrator Psalter, where the iconoclasts are shown with the wild hair of demoniacs, or inspired by evil spirits standing next to them (figs 1-4, 18-20).⁴⁶⁸ This supports the hypothesis that the expulsion of demons from the body of the Gerasene is also a typological allusion to the expulsion of the demonic iconoclasts from the body of the Church.

A passage in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council expresses exactly this parallel between exorcism and cleansing of the Orthodox Church from heretics. In this text iconoclasts who recognise some truths of the Orthodox dogma are

⁴⁶⁶ See, for example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 115 (I.24/II.17:29), 142 (III.41:35-40), 146 (I.34/II.30/III.46:11-12), 147 (I.36/II.32:5-7); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 24D, 48C, 73C-76C, 80E-85C; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 476CD, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 168 (§ 92:145-46); *Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, ed. Munitiz *et alii* (1997), 39-41 (§ 7.6). For the reference to miracles performed or recorded by icons in the Seventh Ecumenical Council see Giakalis (1994), 46-49.

⁴⁶⁷ See p. 86, n. 257. Also Mango (1980), 159-64, for Byzantine beliefs relating demons to disorder and heresy. Characteristic examples of iconophile texts mentioning the oppositions of demons to icons: John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 71 (II.4/III.2), 124 (III.13), 165-66 (I.64-65/II.67-68). The last three passages (pp. 124, 165-66) quote a story about a demon fighting against icon veneration narrated in the *Leimonarion* by Sophronios of Jerusalem, which is also quoted twice in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi*, XIII, 60D-61B, 193AB. John of Damascus notes also that icon veneration brings shame to the devil and his demons and honours those who triumph against them, i.e. Christ and his saints, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 99-100 (II.10/III.9a:64-72/86-97), 101-102 (II.11/III.10).

⁴⁶⁸ See p. 50, n. 92, pp. 82-83 above.

compared to the demons which in Christ's miracles of exorcism (like that of the Gerasene) recognized Jesus as the Son of God, and in a similar miracle performed by Paul address the Apostle as a man of the Lord (Acts 16:16-18). The closing comment declares that since the iconoclasts insist on rejecting the veneration of icons, they remain wicked like those evil spirits, and must be expelled from the holy congregation of the faithful, just as the demons were not spared by Christ and Paul.⁴⁶⁹ The miniature of the Chludov Psalter is a successful and eloquent visualization of this specific passage, since it combines in one composition both Christ and Paul, with both apparently involved in the expulsion of the (iconoclast) demons – the first in person, and the second through his icon. Even if the ninth-century artist and viewers of this miniature were not familiar with this exact passage of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, the imagery would seem to reflect a mentality that relates iconoclasts to demons, and consequently their defeat to an act of exorcism. The same mentality surfaces in another passage of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, again with specific reference to Christ's exorcization miracles like that of the Gerasene. In the sixth session, the Fathers declared that "We certainly do not accept from the alien ones (i.e. the iconoclasts) ways of demonstrating our faith. Thus Jesus rebuked the demons, even when they were confessing him as God, because he deemed it unworthy to be witnessed to by demons."⁴⁷⁰ A similar comparison is set forth in two epistles by Theodore the Studite: iconoclasts are said to be like the demons that confessed Christ to be the Son of God, but denied him in their actions.⁴⁷¹ On the other hand, Patriarch Nikephoros considers iconoclasts worse than the demons that confessed Christ because, contrary to evil spirits, heretics fight him in his icons, not recognizing that, being the Incarnated Logos, he should indeed be shown and venerated through holy images.⁴⁷²

Other commonplace expressions of iconophile literature offer further clues as to the possible typological allusions of the exorcization miracle on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter. Iconophiles often compared their opponents to pigs wallowing in the filth of sin,⁴⁷³ and claimed that, because of their disrespectful treatment of icons, they

⁴⁶⁹ *Mansi* XIII, 345BC; trans. Sahas (1986), 161.

⁴⁷⁰ *Mansi* XIII, 277DE; trans. Sahas (1986), 105.

⁴⁷¹ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 177 (epistle 64:41-44), 663 (463:61-64).

⁴⁷² *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 629D-632A; *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 43 (§19:60-62).

⁴⁷³ (Cf. Psalm 79:14 "The boar out of the wood has laid it (the vine of the Lord) waste, and the wild beast has devoured it", interpreted by Didymos as a reference to evil powers and passions, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg [1975-78], II, 139:13-20, §828; also *II. Peter* 2:22 "A sow that is washed goes

had fallen into the abyss of impiety.⁴⁷⁴ (Both comparisons are often used in Early Christian and Byzantine literature with regard to sinners generally, and heretics in particular).⁴⁷⁵ In the miniature, the swine about to be possessed and to fall over the precipice are represented above the icon of St Paul, almost stepping on it, as if to indicate exactly how bound the “pig-like” iconoclasts were to fall into the abyss of sin and perdition because of their desecration and destruction of icons. Indeed, a characteristic excerpt from the Seventh Ecumenical Council says that the iconoclasts are like swine treading on pearls (*Matthew* 7:6), the pearls being the tradition of the Church concerning the veneration of icons.⁴⁷⁶ In the *Life of Stephen the Younger*, Leo III is likewise compared to swine trampling on pearls because of his iconoclastic policy.⁴⁷⁷ It is significant that the same exegetical tradition is followed in two Middle Byzantine commentaries on *Matthew* that see the swine possessed by the demons and falling over the precipice in the exorcism of the Gerasene as a metaphor for sinful men destroyed by their passions.⁴⁷⁸

An iconophile familiar with commentaries on Psalm 67:31 would be even more aware of the possible anti-iconoclastic allusions of the relevant Chludov

back to her wallowing in the mud” about sinners.) See For example, Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 220C (quoting Psalm 79:14), 229C, 276B, 289AB, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 133 (§78:2), 257 (§160:15), both quoting *II. Peter* 2:22; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 27 (epistle 8:12-13), 397 (268:40), 413 (277:34-35), all quoting Psalm 79:14 (in the first case in relation not to iconoclasm but to the second wedding of Constantine VI); *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 124:21-22 (§27), quoting Psalm 79:14 about Constantine V; likewise about Leo V in the *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 276A.

⁴⁷⁴ For example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 352A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 248AB, 305D, 313B, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 501C-504A, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 568AB, 613D, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 69 (§31:39-43), 116 (§71:56), 131 (§75:26).

⁴⁷⁵ Concerning the metaphorical use of swine living in the filth, examples in: Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 368D, 369B; Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 957D-960A; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 87 (IV:122-26), 88 (IV:141-42), 259 (XIV.2:15), 260/263 (XIV.2:30/131); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), 42 (epistle 2:61-64), *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), V, 26:43, VII, 211:19, VIII, 89:14-16; see also Lampe (1961), 880, “μονιός”; 1526-27, “χοῖρος”, “χοιρότροπος”, “χοιρώδης”; and 301 “βόρβορος”, “βορβορώ”, “βορβορώδης”. Concerning the abyss of impiety, examples in: Act of the First Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* II, 855AB; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1020B, 1048C; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 932CD, 937B; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 141/142 (IX.2:60-62/87-88), 268 (XV:89-91), 313 (XXIII:342-43); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 86 (epistle 33:4), III, 28 (284:858), 99 (285:40-41), *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), VIII, 84:35, 86:16. See also Lampe (1961), 288, “βάραθρον”; 306, “βοθός”, 2.a; and 777, “κρημνός”.

⁴⁷⁶ *Mansi* XIII, 352C. Cf. Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 660E-661A; Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), V, 10:34-11:10, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 99-102 (epistle 55:1/6-11/46-47).

⁴⁷⁷ Ed. Auzépy (1997), 98:20 (§9).

⁴⁷⁸ Theophylaktos of Ochrid (eleventh century), *Enarratio in Matthaum*, PG 123, 225AB (cf. *In Marcum*, PG 123, 540A-541A on the same miracle described in *Mark* 5:1-13); Euthymios Zigabenos (twelfth century), *Commentarius in Matthaum*, PG 129, 301A.

miniature. Eusebios sees the “wild beasts of the reed” mentioned in verse 31 as a reference to the devil, the demons, the evil powers that oppose the gospel teaching, and “poisonous and crawling spirits”,⁴⁷⁹ i.e. serpent-like thinking, which in Early Christian literature was a synonym for impiety and heresy, as mentioned earlier.⁴⁸⁰ According to Didymos,⁴⁸¹ the “wild beasts of the reed” are men who support false knowledge and propagate it with their writings (a reference to the Greek word for reed, *κάλαμος*, which also denotes a writing implement).⁴⁸² The comment by Cyril of Alexandria is even more specifically anti-heretic: he identifies the “wild beasts of the reed” with the inventors of heresies, whose writings are false and perverted, produced by a *κάλαμος* that works like the sharp teeth of beasts devouring the souls of the simple-minded.⁴⁸³ Cyril relates the “wild beasts of the reed” to the fierce lions and other wild animals that infested an area around Jerusalem (called “Reed” after the local vegetation) and attacked pilgrims to the holy city. According to the tropological reading he proposes, Christians setting out to reach the ideal Jerusalem (of moral and spiritual perfection) are threatened by demons trying to turn them aside from their goal and devour their soul with evil thoughts and temptations.⁴⁸⁴ A similar interpretation of Psalm 67:31 is recorded in the commentary by Athanasios.⁴⁸⁵ In other words, psalm commentaries and iconophile literature alike support the hypothesis that the illustration of Psalm 67:31 in the Chludov Psalter can be interpreted as a pronounced anti-heretical and especially anti-iconoclastic statement. The eloquence of the image, able to combine and elaborate messages from more than one sources in one composition, is further proof of the iconophile belief in the equal, if not superior value and power of icons in comparison to the written word.

The sophisticated correlation of the miniatures on folio 65r exemplifies the advantage of the visual text over the written one when it comes to communicating a multi-faceted and complicated message. It might be said that the length of this attempt to interpret the illumination of folio 65r, in comparison to the concise character and direct impact of the illustration itself, is an indication of this fact. But there is still

⁴⁷⁹ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 713D-716A.

⁴⁸⁰ See pp. 85-86 above.

⁴⁸¹ *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 73 (number 702a).

⁴⁸² Liddell – Scott (1948), 866, “*κάλαμος*”, 5 (reed-pen); cf. Lampe (1961), 696, “*καλαμάριον*” (pen-case, pen-holder).

⁴⁸³ *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1157D.

⁴⁸⁴ *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1157C.

⁴⁸⁵ *In psalmos*, PG 27, 303A.

more that might be said. There is yet another possible link between the scene of exorcism and of the Ethiopian's baptism, which indicates the successful choice and combination of subject matter on the whole page and its expressive and allusive power.

The passage from *Acts* narrating the baptism performed by Philip was one of the New Testament readings in the Byzantine rite of baptism according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*.⁴⁸⁶ A basic theme in the Christian rite of initiation was the exorcism of demons that might have held the soul of the catechumen in their influence before his or her baptism.⁴⁸⁷ In this sense the expulsion of the unclean spirits from the Gerasene on folio 65r may be seen as complementary to the Ethiopian's baptism, as a reference to the rebuking and expelling of demons in Orthodox baptism. Relevant to this is the prayer still recited in the Orthodox Church today at the beginning of the baptismal ceremony, when the priest addresses the demon in order to remind him of the miracle of the Gerasene, when the evil spirits that were expelled from the man entered into a herd of swine, driving them in the sea where they were drowned.⁴⁸⁸ The disappearance of the demons and the swine (symbolizing the sins of the flesh) in the waters of the sea can be seen, then, as an allusion to the purification of the soul and the washing out of all sins by the holy water of baptism, as shown on folio 65r by the story of the Ethiopian eunuch. Just as exorcism and baptism are complementary in the rite of initiation, so the episode of the eunuch's baptism complements the scene of the Gerasene's exorcism, denoting that the water that washed away the sins of the Ethiopian also removes the evil embodied in the demons and swine. On these grounds one might see a liturgical influence on the iconography of this page, aside from the influence of psalm commentaries.⁴⁸⁹

A further consideration in the analysis of this page is the homily by Gregory Nazianzenus *In sanctum baptismum*, which was read in the Byzantine liturgy on January 7th and concerns baptism.⁴⁹⁰ Gregory speaks of the unclean spirit expelled

⁴⁸⁶ Ed. Mateos (1962-63), I, 186; II, 62, 138.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. John Chrysostom, *Eight baptismal catecheses*, SC 50, 139-40 (II.12), *Three baptismal catecheses*, SC 366, 44-46, 188-94 (II.6-7); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical catecheses*, SC 126, 84-88, 98, 108. The expulsion of demons is a very prominent element in today's baptismal rite in the Greek Orthodox Church, following closely the Byzantine tradition (*Euchologion* [1998], 79ff.).

⁴⁸⁸ *Euchologion* (1998), 81.

⁴⁸⁹ The term "liturgical" is used here to refer to any rite and service performed in the Byzantine Church, and not just to the Divine Liturgy, the Eucharist (see also p. 225 below).

⁴⁹⁰ Galavaris (1969), 11 (p. 10 for the issue of date of the liturgical collection of Gregory's homilies. The two ninth-century codices mentioned in note 22 do not include the homily *In sanctum baptismum*).

from the initiate during baptism: fearing the water it drowns in it, just like the legion of demons that left the Gerasene were drowned in the sea.⁴⁹¹ Gregory himself actually presents the mystery of baptism as a re-enactment of the incident narrated in *Acts* 8:26-40. “I am Philip”, he makes the priest say. “Become Candaces (the Ethiopian eunuch)” he prompts the person to be baptised, adding: “even if you were Ethiopian in the body, you will be whitened in the soul.”⁴⁹² This provides an additional reason for arguing that the association between the two gospel images in this page was one that was regularly made in Byzantine thinking.

The correlation of the exorcization miracle and the Ethiopian’s baptism by common reference to the cleansing of the soul in the water where sins and evil spirits drown is even more obvious in the illustration of the same psalm verses in the eleventh-century Theodore and Barberini Psalters. In these two codices, Psalm 65:28 is illustrated with an icon of St Paul on folios 84v and 111v respectively.⁴⁹³ Here the miniature is separated from the illustration of verses 31-32, the miracle and baptism scenes being shown on the facing folios, 85r (fig. 113) and 112r respectively.⁴⁹⁴ For this reason, the exorcism of the Gerasene does not evolve around St Paul’s icon, as in the Chludov miniature, a fact which deprives the composition of the iconophile implications present in the ninth-century psalter. Instead, the two eleventh-century codices depict the miracle in its standard iconographic type, with the demons and swine heading towards the lake below the feet of Christ and the Gerasene (not above them and around Paul’s icon, as in the Chludov Psalter). Appearing directly above the Ethiopian’s head, as if about to fall into the same water in which he is being baptised and purified from sin, the demons and swine seem to represent also the evil spirits destroyed by the man’s baptism. In the two eleventh-century psalters, it is the baptismal and consequently liturgical allusions in the illustration of Psalm 67:31-32 that are more accentuated, in the Chludov Psalter it is the iconophile implications that dominate.

According to the *Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos (1962-63), I, 190-191, on January 7th the lections were from *Acts* 19:1-8 and from *John* 1:29-34, both referring to the baptism of those who believe in Christ.

⁴⁹¹ PG 36, 409A.

⁴⁹² PG 36, 396A. In the Greek text of *Acts* 8:27 “ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ ἐννοῦχος δυνάστης Κανδάκης βασιλείσης Αἰθιοπῶν”, it is not clear if Candaces is the name of the eunuch (as in Gregory’s homily) or of his queen (as according to the translation in the *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, ed. Marshall [1976], 500).

⁴⁹³ Der Nersessian (1970), 37, pl. 137; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 96.

⁴⁹⁴ Der Nersessian (1970), 37, pl. 138; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 97.

However, it is possible that liturgical practice influenced the choice to illustrate Psalm 67:31 with the miracle of the Gerasene in the Chludov Psalter in still another way. In the rite followed by the Greek Orthodox Church today in cases of exorcism, Psalm 67 is fully recited.⁴⁹⁵ The difficulty here is to know whether modern Orthodox practice goes back to the Middle Ages.⁴⁹⁶ The modern rite of exorcism includes a prayer attributed to John Chrysostom, in which the only specific exorcization miracle referred to is that of the Gerasene as the most representative of such miracles performed by Christ, since then he expelled a whole legion of demons.⁴⁹⁷ If the same prayer was indeed used in Byzantine times also, the combined reference to Psalm 67 and *Mark* 5:1-20 in the same context of exorcism may have been an additional source of inspiration for choosing to illustrate verse 31 on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter with the miracle of the Gerasene.

The correlation between the exorcism and the baptism on folio 65r can be seen to go beyond their common liturgical and typological references to the mystery of baptism. Just as the expulsion of demons from the Gerasene can be taken to stand for defeating the demonic iconoclast heresy, so the salvation of the Ethiopian through belief in Christ's Incarnation and his baptism can be seen as the purification of every soul that embraces the Orthodox dogma of the Christian Church. Patristic literature considers the Ethiopians mentioned in Biblical scriptures as a typological reference to those of unclean soul, since the black skin is considered not just a physical attribute, but also a sign of the dark and unclean state of the mind and spirit. For example, in their commentaries, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus interpret the Ethiopians mentioned in Psalms 71:9, 73:14, and 86:4 as men with a black soul, ignorant of the divine light.⁴⁹⁸ Talking about Psalm 67:32 in particular (the verse illustrated on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter), Cyril considers Ethiopia "stretching out her hand to God" as a reference to nations that are dark in sin (and asking to be saved by the Lord).⁴⁹⁹ Epiphanius of Cyprus in his *Panarion* considers the Ethiopians of Psalm 73:14 as heretics darkened by sin.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁵ *Euchologion* (1998), 288-91.

⁴⁹⁶ According to Mango (1980), 163, Psalm 67 was an exorcism psalm in Byzantium as well.

⁴⁹⁷ *Euchologion* (1998), 312.

⁴⁹⁸ Cyril *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1181C, 1188A; Theodoret *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1464A, 1565B.

⁴⁹⁹ *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1166B.

⁵⁰⁰ PG 41, 357C (see also 1072A).

It is not uncommon in Byzantine literature to speak about demons in the form of Ethiopians, black-skinned figures.⁵⁰¹ A most characteristic case is a passage from the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilos* describing a vision in which an Ethiopian cut a fruitful olive-tree from the ambo of St Sophia and defiled the church together with the emperor and his army, the Ethiopian being the iconoclast Patriarch Theodotos (815-21) who took the place of the deposed Patriarch Nikephoros (the olive-tree).⁵⁰² Moreover, iconophile writers claimed that the communion with iconoclasts darkens the soul.⁵⁰³ It is possible, therefore, that the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch as depicted on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter could also be meant to allude to the conversion of iconoclasts to the true faith of Orthodoxy, especially since it is the belief in Christ's Incarnation that leads to acceptance of venerating the life-saving icons – the same belief that led the Ethiopian eunuch to his salvation through baptism. As Gregory Nazianzenus writes in his homily *In sanctum baptisma*, through a conversion to the true faith of Christ, such as was undergone by the Ethiopian baptized by Philip, the soul becomes whitened even though the body might remain black.⁵⁰⁴ In other words, the Ethiopian's baptism symbolises the illumination of a person by the true knowledge of God offered through the Incarnation of the Logos in Jesus Christ – a truth that leads also to the veneration of icons. Accordingly, the conversion of this Ethiopian eunuch on folio 65r of the Chludov Psalter might be related to the affirmation of a belief in icons, not only because this episode from the New Testament is a historical incident associated with the discourse of the Incarnation and the fulfilment of scriptures, but also because it may stand as a typological reference to the abandonment of heretic darkness for an immersion in the light of Orthodoxy. The analogous typological allusions of the exorcization miracle depicted above enhance the potential of such an interpretation of the baptism scene with a second layer of meaning, aside from the direct and most obvious function of the miniature as illustrating the prophetic reference of Psalm 67:32 to Acts 8:26-40.

⁵⁰¹ For example, George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 679:10, 680:11/20; Theophylaktos of Ochrid, *Enarratio in Joannem*, PG 129, 1244D (with reference to Psalm 73:14). See also Lampe (1961), 48, “*Αἰθίοψ*”; Provatakis (1980), 50, 52-54.

⁵⁰² Ed. Munitiz *et alii* (1997), 73-75 (§12.a-12.f).

⁵⁰³ For example, Theodore the Studite says in his *Epistulae*, ed. Fatourso (1992), 344 (epistle 221:39-40), 451 (308:9-10): “Ὡν (εἰκονομάχων) τὴν κοινωνίαν, ἀδελφοί, ὡς ἰὸν ὄψεως, μελαίνουσιν οὐ σῶμα, ὡς ποῦ φησιν ὁ Θεολόγος, ἀλλὰ τὰ βάθη τῆς ψυχῆς”; “ἢ παρὰ τῶν αἵρετικῶν κοινωνία οὐ κοινὸς ἄρτος, ἀλλὰ φάρμακον, οὐ σῶμα βλάπτον, ἀλλὰ ψυχὴν μελαῖνον καὶ σκοτίζον”.

⁵⁰⁴ PG 36, 396A.

The illuminated page examined in this chapter is one of the most evocative and complex visual texts in the manuscript, both because of its wealth of sources used and for the multi-layered structure of its message. It alerts us to the complexities that are possible in this ninth-century codex, and to the need to explore the references to scripture and theology that underlie the imagery. The analysis in the next section of a miniature that combines three different gospel episodes in one composition will give further examples of this highly elaborate use of the visual language in the margins of the ninth-century Byzantine psalters.

Psalm 84: Christ the healer and redeemer
(*Chludov Psalter, folio 84v*)

Folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter shows Christ standing before the protagonists of three different gospel episodes (fig. 117).⁵⁰⁵ In the top-left corner of the page, standing in a tree, is Zacchaeus, the tax-collector who climbed into a sycamore tree to see Christ passing by; when Christ asked to stay the night at his house he repented of his sins and offered to give half of his belongings to the poor (*Luke* 19:1-10). Immediately to the left of Christ is the woman who had been bleeding for twelve years, and who was cured and absolved from her sins when she touched Christ's robe with the faith that this act would cure her (*Matthew* 9:20-22, *Mark* 5:25-34, *Luke* 8:43-48). She is shown in supplication. Below her is the prostitute whose sins were forgiven when she washed Christ's feet with her tears, dried them with her hair and anointed them with myrrh (*Luke* 7:36-50). This miniature accompanies Psalm 84:3 "Thou didst forgive the iniquities of thy people..." and illustrates it with three representative sinners who repented and were forgiven by Christ.

The miniature is unique in its eclectic choice of imagery from the New Testament (three separate events narrated in different gospels). To my knowledge, the only other surviving examples in Byzantine art of such a conflation are two miniatures with exactly the same subject, again illustrating Psalm 84:3. They appear in later marginal psalters, the eleventh-century Barberini Psalter (itself indirect copy

⁵⁰⁵ Briefly presented also in Evangelatou (2001a).

of the Chludov Psalter) and the fourteenth-century Hamilton Psalter.⁵⁰⁶ The absence of such a composition from the Utrecht, the Stuttgart and the Bristol Psalter supports the idea that this imagery did not belong to the tradition of psalm illustration before Iconoclasm. Most likely it is an innovation of the ninth century, appearing for the first time in the Chludov Psalter itself (or a similar and contemporary psalter, now lost). In this case we need to investigate the specific reasoning that produced the composition, and whether it could be related to iconophile polemics.

The first point to note is the frequency with which a number of repentant and forgiven sinners from various gospel episodes are mentioned together in Early Christian and Byzantine religious writings. They appear in hymns, homilies, and theological discourses as moral examples for the faithful, and demonstrate God's clemency and forgiveness of those who repent.⁵⁰⁷ The most frequently cited couple of all such figures, mentioned alone or with other repentant sinners, are the tax-collector (either the anonymous figure in the parable of the tax-collector and the Pharisee in *Luke* 18:10-14, or Zacchaeus) and the prostitute, the woman referred to in *Luke* 7:36-50.⁵⁰⁸ Other such figures often quoted are the good thief, the Canaanite woman, the

⁵⁰⁶ Barberini Psalter, folio 145v, Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 111-12; Hamilton Psalter, folio 160v, Havice (1978), 433 (she identifies Zacchaeus and the woman in haemorrhage, and mentions two other “sinners”, both women, shown in the same miniature. The prostitute may be the one with the “streaming hair”; Dufrenne [1978] names in the Hamilton miniature Zacchaeus, the prostitute and the woman in haemorrhage). In the Theodore Psalter Christ's meeting with Zacchaeus and the prostitute is shown in two separate miniatures on folio 113r, Der Nersessian (1970), 44, fig. 186. For the Pantokrator Psalter which conflates only the episodes with Zacchaeus and the prostitute see below, p. 154, fig. 118. The conflation of gospel episodes in two miniatures of the ninth-century cod. Paris. gr. 923 of the *Sacra Parallela* is of a different nature: on folio 212r Christ appears simultaneously in front of figures that are mentioned in the same gospel chapter the one after the other (Jairus and the woman in haemorrhage, *Luke* 8:41-44 – the same conflation in the eleventh-century cod. Paris. gr. 74; Weitzmann [1979], 174-75, fig. 454); on folio 260r the healing of the paralytic of Bethesda (*John* 5:14) is combined with the true vine (*John* 15:1-2), because the two passages appear in the codex of the *Sacra Parallela* the one after the other (Weitzmann [1979], 181-82, fig. 479; for the second conflation and its symbolic significance see also Evangelatou [2002].)

⁵⁰⁷ Examples in: Gregory Nazianzenus, *In sancta lumina*, PG 36, 356A/C, *In sanctum baptisma*, PG 36, 405B; Epiphanius of Cyprus *In sanctam Christi resurrectionem (dubia)*, PG 43, 473B; John Chrysostom, *In psalmos (dubia)*, PG 55, 531, 548, 576, 577, 678; Andrew of Crete, *Magnus canon*, PG 97, 1356CD, 1364D, 1377A, 1384B-D; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 689/691 (epistle 477:65-76/116-23). See also the following note.

⁵⁰⁸ Examples in: John Chrysostom, *In psalmos (dubia)*, PG 55, 543, 641, *In Thomam (spuria)*, PG 59, 687; Proclus of Constantinople, *New Homilies*, ed. Leroy (1967), 194 (homily 27, X.58), 250 (homily 33, XV.59); Andrew of Crete, *Magnus canon*, PG 97, 1337C, 1376D-1377A, 1381AB, 1384B, 1412C; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 628AB; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 717 (epistle 487:28-39); Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), VIII, 148:18-20; *Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos (1962-63), II, 26:13-15, 28:4-6, 30:15-17 (three *troparia* of Lent); *Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), II, 67:6-10, 75:30-34.

repentant Apostle Peter or King David.⁵⁰⁹ Proclus of Constantinople, in a homily on Christmas day where he mentions various natural elements and people that prepare their offerings to Christ, speaks of “the woman in haemorrhage (who offers) faith; the prostitute (who offers) myrrh; the trees (which offer) Zacchaeus;”⁵¹⁰ –the three figures shown on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter. John of Damascus in a passage of his *Carmina* mentions together five repentant and saved sinners, three of which are the tax-collector, the prostitute and the woman in haemorrhage – the other two being the Canaanite woman and the good thief.⁵¹¹ Perhaps the three figures shown in the Chludov miniature were mentioned together also in other texts, but it is not necessary to suppose that the planner of this composition depended on a specific literary source for his choice. My hypothesis is that in his selective treatment of the gospel story the planner was influenced generally by the literary tradition mentioned above (selective reference to various repentant sinners), while the specific selection of the three sinners may have originated in certain ideas and texts of iconophile polemics. Some relevant suggestions will be made below.

One place to look at is the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787, which ended the first period of Iconoclasm and restored icon veneration. In one passage of the sixth session it is argued that words and images appeal to the senses of the faithful and lead them to a moral life through both hearing and sight. Images are said to have the didactic power to remind the faithful of the moral principles of Christian life, and help them avoid sin or induce them to repent by presenting them with venerable examples from the scriptures.⁵¹² The first example mentioned in this passage speaks of the uprooting of greed and avarice with the help of an icon of Matthew (the tax-collector who became Apostle) or “of Zacchaeus climbing a sycamore because he wanted to see Christ, and making a commitment to him to give half of his goods to the poor and, if he had defrauded anyone of anything, to return four times as much”.⁵¹³ The second example concerns the carnal passion of adultery which can be resisted by the image of the chaste Joseph or the blessed Susanna.⁵¹⁴ In our miniature on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter, the example of Zacchaeus fits with

⁵⁰⁹ For examples see references in the two previous notes.

⁵¹⁰ *In natalem diem domini*, PG 65, 713D; among the other sinners mentioned in 713C are the Samaritan woman, the Canaanite woman and the anonymous tax-collector.

⁵¹¹ PG 96, 817AB.

⁵¹² *Mansi* XIII, 360B.

⁵¹³ *Mansi* XIII, 360BC, trans. Sahas (1986), 171-72.

⁵¹⁴ *Mansi* XIII, 360C.

this text. The repentant prostitute is also a figure emblematic of the fight against adultery and lust. Compared to Joseph or Susanna, she is better suited for the illustration of the verse “Thou didst forgive the iniquities of thy people,” since it was she and not the Old Testament figures that committed the carnal sin which she later repented and for which she received forgiveness. Similarly the woman in haemorrhage, although not mentioned in the discussions at the Seventh Ecumenical Council, follows the spirit of the relevant passage, enhancing the didactic overtone of the miniature. This woman appears frequently in Early Christian and Byzantine literature as an exemplary convert to morality: she demonstrates the power of faith, since it was her strong belief in Christ that brought about her cure when she touched the Lord’s clothes and led him to recognize her as worthy of forgiveness (*Mark* 5:28-34).⁵¹⁵ To conclude, the miniature on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter does not seem to have an identifiable single source, but conceptually the figures are carefully selected to visually enhance the moral message of the psalm text. They combine the appeal of both word and image for the edification of the users of the psalter, and consequently make a specific statement about the value and use of icons, in line with the passage from the Seventh Ecumenical Council mentioned above.

It may be that the woman in haemorrhage as one of the three sinners in the miniature is a special case here, for she has a specific and prominent significance in iconophile literature.⁵¹⁶ A key text in this respect is the fourth-century *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* by Eusebios of Caesarea, in which it is recorded that as a thank-offering for her cure the woman had erected a statue of herself at the feet of Christ in front of her house. Beside Christ’s figure was growing a miraculous plant that could cure a variety of diseases, so proving the sacred nature of the statue itself.⁵¹⁷ This sculpture is mentioned again in the fifth century by Philostorgios, continuator of Eusebios’ *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*,⁵¹⁸ and in the sixth century by Malalas in his

⁵¹⁵ Origen, *In Matthaeum*, PG 13, 884BC; Athanasios, *In caecum a nativitate (spuria)*, PG 28, 1112AB; John Chrysostom, *In principium indictionis (spuria)*, PG 59, 575, 578; *In sanguinis fluxu laborantem (spuria)*, PG 64, 19-20; Proclos of Constantinople, *In natalem diem domini*, PG 65, 713D; Andrew of Crete, *Magnus Canon*, PG 97, 1356CD, 1377A; Theodore the Studite, *Iambi*, PG 99, 1780C; Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), VIII, 99:27-31; Theophylaktos of Ochrid, *Enarratio in Matthaeum*, *Enarratio in Marcum*, PG 123, 232A, 544A; Euthymios Zigabenos, *Commentarius in Lucam*, PG 129, 944B, 945A..

⁵¹⁶ Some of the texts referred to below are also mentioned by Charib (1993), 28-34.

⁵¹⁷ PG 20, 680B-C (VII, 18).

⁵¹⁸ VII, 3; Greek text in Dobschütz (1899), 257*-258*.

Chronographia.⁵¹⁹ The statue was apparently destroyed in the sixth or seventh century, but the circumstances are unknown.⁵²⁰ Particularly frequent references to it appear in iconophile literature, since its alleged dedication by the cured woman provided many arguments in support of images. According to the iconophiles, the creation of this statue already in apostolic times proved that the use of holy images was indeed a very old and venerable tradition in the Church, sanctioned by the apostles or even Christ himself, by not being opposed to it.⁵²¹ Equally crucial was the fact that miraculous cures were effected by the plant growing at the feet of Christ's statue. This was cited to prove the holiness of this and other images, and to refute iconoclastic accusations that icons were idolatrous and demonic objects.⁵²² The statue also provided a valid example of the commemorative nature of images that remind the faithful of holy persons and their deeds, in order to edify the viewer and honour the figures depicted.⁵²³ It was even claimed that the existence of this sculpture offered the strongest evidence possible that the miraculous healing of the bleeding woman by Christ had really occurred, so providing a palpable example of how images can not only commemorate but even prove the truth of Christ's Incarnation and life on earth.⁵²⁴

The Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council mention the statue no less than four times.⁵²⁵ Major iconophile authors, such as Patriarchs Germanos and Nikephoros or John of Damascus and George the Monk, make repeated references to this image of

⁵¹⁹ PG 97, 236-239 (X). The statue was mentioned in other texts as well, for example, Antipatros of Bostra, *Fragmenta*, PG 85, 1793D (quoted in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 13DE, and by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone [1997], 156-57 [§ 88:4-12]); Asterios of Amaseia, as in note 524 below.

⁵²⁰ Charib (1993), 30.

⁵²¹ Germanos of Constantinople, *Ad Thomam Claudiopoleos*, PG 98, 188, quotes Eusebios on the existence of the statue and claims that Christ himself did not reject this monument, but considered it appropriate that his miracle should be commemorated in this way. The same claim is put forward in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 125E-128A, while in 268CE, it is emphasized that this statue was erected already in apostolic times and was later mentioned by many Fathers of the Church. Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 141 (§82:41-56), 319-320 (§200:5-15), notes that the apostles did not reject this statue, and he claims that it was an ancient evidence for the veneration of icons.

⁵²² The miraculous plant is mentioned by: Germanos of Constantinople, *Ad Thomam Claudiopoleos*, PG 98, 188; John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 173 (III.69); Acts of Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 93D, 125E, 268D; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 540:8-9, 786:11-20.

⁵²³ For example, Germanos of Constantinople, *Ad Thomam Claudiopoleos*, PG 98, 188; Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 93DE, 125D-128A.

⁵²⁴ Patriarch Nikephoros, in his *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 384C, and his *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 154-56 (§87:9-57), mentions the homily of Asterios of Amaseia on the woman in haemorrhage, known also from Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77) VIII, 99:5-100:21, where it is stated that the existence of the statue was proof of the woman's miraculous healing.

⁵²⁵ *Mansi* XIII, 13DE, 93DE, 125DE, 268CE.

the cured woman at the feet of Christ.⁵²⁶ Nikephoros and George the Monk emphasize that the statue and the miracles effected by the plant were recorded by Eusebios of Caesarea.⁵²⁷ This was a fact of the greatest significance for the iconophiles, because Eusebios' writings opposed the portraiture of Christ and the apostles as being against Christian custom and pertinent to the culture of idolaters, and iconoclasts quoted him as an example of patristic adversity to icon veneration.⁵²⁸ Nikephoros and George the Monk argued that Eusebios was proven wrong by his own words, since not only did he record the statue of the healed woman at Jesus' feet dating from apostolic times, but in the same passage he also mentioned the dissemination of images showing Christ, Peter and Paul, thereby attesting to an old and widespread tradition of image making and veneration in the Church.⁵²⁹

Since it would seem that the planners and viewers of the Chludov Psalter were very probably aware of the iconophile significance of referring to the woman in haemorrhage, we need to look in more detail at this miniature. The woman is shown touching Christ's leg at the height of his knee with the index finger of her right hand, and raising her left in a gesture of invocation. It was usual, however, both before and after iconoclasm, to show her either holding or even pulling the hem of Christ's

⁵²⁶ Patriarch Germanos, *Ad Thomam Claudiopoleos*, PG 98, 188, *Epistola Gregorii papae Romani*, PG 98, 149C; Patriarch Nikephoros, four times in his *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 141 (§82:41-56), 154-56 (§87:9-57), 156-57 (§88), 319-20 (§200:5-15), and once in his *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 384C; John of Damascus, twice in his *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 171-72 (III.68), 173 (III.69). George the Monk, three times in his *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 540:8-19, 739:9-740:15, 786:11-20. Also mentioned in *Adversus Constantinum Cabalinum*, PG 95, 326A.

⁵²⁷ Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 156-157 (§88:19-27), 319-320 (§200:5-15); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 786:11-20.

⁵²⁸ In his *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, PG 20, 680CD (VII, 18), Eusebios considers the statue dedicated by the woman in haemorrhage and the paintings showing Christ, Peter, and Paul, that he himself had seen, as made according to pagan usage. In his letter to Constantia, sister of Constantine I, he likewise rejects the depiction of Christ in icons as idolatrous, and he mentions two images that a woman gave him as portraits of Christ and Paul, which he kept hidden as objects harmful to Christians, *Epistola ad Constantiam Augustam*, PG 20, 1545-49, esp. 1548B-D. (Passages from both texts translated by Mango [1986], 16-18). In their polemics iconoclasts quoted at least Eusebios' letter to Constantia; indeed, this text made part of the *Definition* of the iconoclast council of 754, known today by its refutation in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XIII*, 208D-356D (Eusebios' letter and its refutation in 313A-317C; Eusebios condemned as Arian, his writings source of iconoclast beliefs in 253A). The same letter is repeatedly mentioned and condemned by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 93-94 (§46), 158-59 (§89), 375-76 (§173), 313-14 (§196), where Eusebios is mentioned as Arian and impious heretic, as also in pp. 43 (§19:80), 116 (§71:43-44), 156-57 (§88), 319-20 (§200:6-25). Nikephoros has also written an entire treatise against Eusebios, *Contra Eusebium*, ed. Pitra (1852), 371-503.

⁵²⁹ As in note 527 above. D. Afinogenov has suggested to me that the iconophile writers' frequent mention of the statue erected by the cured woman may be explained exactly because it was referred to by Eusebios, whose writing were employed by iconoclasts to support their case. Eusebios' reference to the statue is also mentioned by John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 173 (III.69), but without any special comment on the fact that Eusebios speaks of the sculpture, although he opposes the use and veneration of holy icons.

garment (figs 114, 119, 121),⁵³⁰ or stretching out her hands before him in deep prostration, either without making any physical contact (fig. 120),⁵³¹ or holding his feet in sign of veneration.⁵³² The Chludov miniature is the only example known to me in which she is not holding Christ's garment but touching part of his body with the index finger of her hand. This suggests a possible visual reference to the iconophile idea that Christ could be represented in images because he was tangible. In other words, he had a human body that could be and was touched by various people, such as the woman in haemorrhage and, of course, the prostitute who anointed him (also in this miniature).⁵³³

Moreover, the gesture of the infirm woman is rather peculiar, somewhere between pointing at Christ and touching him. This iconographic detail evokes an iconophile passage of Theodore the Studite. Commenting on the fact that John the Baptist had pointed at Christ when uttering the famous words "Behold the Lamb of God" (*John* 1:29), Theodore adds: "That which is seen is circumscribable, not to mention that which is pointed out with the finger". This counts for Theodore as a justification for icons.⁵³⁴ Perhaps the peculiar gesture of the woman reflects this passage. Her index finger is pointing at Jesus as if to say, "This is the Son of Man whom I have touched." The iconophile implications of this miniature recall an

⁵³⁰ For example, on a wall-painting of the second quarter of the fourth century in the Roman catacomb of SS Marcellinus and Petrus, and on a Roman ivory plaque of around 410-420 now in the Musée du Louvre, *Age of Spirituality* (1979), 439, cat. no. 397, and 446-48, cat. no. 407 (figs 114, 119); folio 212r of the ninth-century cod. Paris. gr. 923 (fig. 121), Weitzmann (1979), 174, fig. 454; folios 18r and 71v of the eleventh-century cod. Laur. VI, 23, Velmans (1971), 24, 35-36, figs 30, 142.

⁵³¹ For example, on an amulet dated to the sixth or seventh century (fig. 120), possibly from Egypt, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, *Age of Spirituality* (1979), 440, cat. no. 398 (the detail more visible in Tuerk [1999], fig. 1).

⁵³² For example, folio 122r of the eleventh-century cod. Laur. VI, 23, Velmans (1971), 42, fig. 211.

⁵³³ (Cf. I *John* 1:1 "That ... which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked at and our hands have touched", a passage often quoted in iconophile and other religious texts concerned with Christ's human nature.) Examples of references to Christ's tangibility in iconophile literature: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 963B, *Mansi* XIII, 256C, 282E, 340E; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 189AB, *Antirrhetici I-II*, PG 100, 240C, 272A-C, 292A, 368B, 372A, 373A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 279 (§175:80), 289 (§182:28-29); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrhetici I-III*, PG 99, 332B, 333A, 356A, 389C, 396A, 397AB, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 444A, 445B, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 190 (epistle 71:45), 344 (221:65-67), 580 (416:6-8), 663 (463:50-58); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 80/81 (§18:62-63/80-81). Examples of other texts where Christ's tangibility is considered proof of his human nature: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 633D, 677AB, 692D, 693D, 756AB, 1196A, *Mansi* V, 9A, 25B, 44B, 205A, 209AB, 212A-E; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 360E, 425BC, 433A, 477D; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 792BC, 732C-733A (reference to the prostitute touching Christ), 736B (reference to the woman in haemorrhage touching Christ), PG 42, 681C (reference to the prostitute touching Christ), 816A, 817A; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 176 (X.2:19), 218-21 (XIII.3:27-28/37/72/100), 256/257 (XIV:7/25).

⁵³⁴ Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 99, 404C, trans. Roth (1981), 89. Also mentioned in a different context by Corrigan (1992), 75.

exegesis on the relevant gospel episode in two Middle Byzantine commentaries, where it is stated that the bleeding woman was healed when she touched Christ's garment, i.e. "his flesh", and whoever believes in the Incarnation touches Christ's garment (his flesh) like her and achieves salvation.⁵³⁵ This comment not only emphasizes the importance of physical contact as proof of Christ's human nature, it also suggests that every Christian can see himself in the role of the woman in haemorrhage, saved from sin through faith in the Incarnation – a faith declared also through the veneration of Christ's image.

Both the women in this miniature, therefore, stress Christ's tangibility, and Zacchaeus too is part of the same argument. For iconophile writers, the fact that Jesus had a human body confined in time and space (i.e. was bodily present only at one place at a time, was arriving at or departing from a town, was entering or leaving a house – all of which are attested in his meeting with Zacchaeus, *Luke* 19:1/5) are proof of his human nature, which of course is the main justification for his representation in images.⁵³⁶ Many other Chludov miniatures can be also related to this iconophile argument of Christ's circumscription in time and place, the most obvious being his Entombment and especially the novel iconography of his rising from the Tomb, as well as the frequent depiction of the Sepulchre, discussed in the following section of this chapter.

The bodily circumscription of Christ and his tangibility are only two of his human attributes used by iconophiles as proof of the Incarnation of the Logos and consequently of the legitimacy of his representation in icons. Other arguments base themselves on gospel accounts of the fact that Jesus could get tired, fall asleep, feel

⁵³⁵ Theophylaktos of Ochrid (eleventh century), *Enarratio in Marcum*, PG 123, 544A; Euthymios Zigabenos (twelfth century), *Commentarius in Lucam*, PG 129, 945BC.

⁵³⁶ Christ's entry to Jericho and his stay at Zacchaeus' house is not specifically mentioned in iconophile texts, but other similar cases (like Christ's absence from Bethany when Lazarus died, proof of his human nature not being omnipresent as his divine nature), or general references to his coming and going to places, walking and sitting, are mentioned, for example, in: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 253C, 337E-340A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrhetici I-II*, PG 100, 304A, 368D-369A; Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 99, 396AB, 401B, 404BC, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 444A, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 344 (epistle 221:61), 493 (359:14-16). For more extensive and generic references to the iconophile argument of Christ's circumscription in time and space see p. 172, n. 617 below. Christ's movement in space is frequently mentioned in Early Christian and Byzantine theology as proof of his human nature. A few examples: Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 732CD-733A (reference to Christ's entrance to the Pharisee's house where the prostitute anointed him according to *Luke* 7:36-38 – the woman depicted on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter); Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 218 (XIII.3:26-27), 256-57 (XIV.1:16-18); Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 425B-D, 484C-E, 708B.

thirsty or hungry, cry, sweat, experience pain, sorrow, agony or anger.⁵³⁷ Many of these human, physical and emotional reactions of Christ are explicit or implicit in various miniatures of the Chludov Psalter, and allow the viewer to recall the narrative details of the gospel episodes. For example, in the incident of the conversion of the Samaritan woman (folio 33r), Christ became tired and thirsty and sat next to the well (*John* 4:6-7). Before he rebuked the wind and sea (folio 88r, fig. 106) he had fallen asleep in the boat on lake Tiberiad (*Mark* 4:38). While praying in Gethsemane (folios 66v, 113r) he was anxious for his oncoming passion and sweating in agony (*Matthew* 26:36-46, *Mark* 14:33-42, *Luke* 22:40-46). When suffering on the Cross (folio 67r, fig. 1), he became thirsty but resented the taste of the vinegar and gall they gave him (*John* 19:28-30).⁵³⁸ By contrast, he rejoiced in the perfume of the myrrh with which the prostitute anointed him (*Luke* 7:38/46), as in the miniature on folio 84v.⁵³⁹ This miniature, therefore, exploits the implications of three different gospel episodes that demonstrate simultaneously Christ's bodily circumscription in the house of Zacchaeus and his tangibility and sense of smell as attested to by the woman in haemorrhage and by the prostitute. The human attributes and reactions of Christ are emphatically presented or alluded to in this miniature as a vehement statement of his Incarnation and consequently his representability in icons.

It is worth making a comparison between the corresponding illustrations of the Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters for verse 84:3, to see that of the two, the Chludov codex is the more aggressively iconophile. Folio 118r of the Pantokrator Psalter has Christ with only two figures, Zacchaeus and the prostitute, to illustrate the verse "Thou didst forgive the iniquities of thy people" (fig. 118).⁵⁴⁰ The absence of the woman in haemorrhage lessens the iconophile impact. Also, the prostitute in the Pantokrator miniature is simply presenting the myrrh container to Jesus as she kneels at his feet, while in the Chludov illustration she is actually touching Christ's feet as she pours the myrrh on them, so emphasizing his bodily nature. The Pantokrator miniature, therefore, primarily stresses God's forgiveness. It has much less of an iconophile flavour than the Chludov Psalter.

⁵³⁷ See p. 123, n. 406 above.

⁵³⁸ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 141 (58, III.14:107-108), and *De duabus voluntatibus*, PG 95, 176AB, mentions these two reactions as proof of Christ's human nature.

⁵³⁹ Mentioned by John of Damascus, *De duabus voluntatibus*, PG 95, 176A, as proof of Christ's human nature.

⁵⁴⁰ Dufrenne (1966), 31, pl. 18.

The iconophile aspect of the Chludov miniature on folio 84v may, like the miniatures with the exorcism of demons or rebuking the wind and the sea examined above, operate on a typological level as well. It has been suggested that the rescues shown on folios 65r and 88r (figs 106, 111) may have been understood as prefiguring the defeat of iconoclasm. Much in the same way, the cures of sin and sickness of the New Testament figures shown on folio 84v may have been equated with the rescue from heresy that the Orthodox Church rejoiced in at the end of iconoclasm. There is support for this in iconophile texts, where iconoclasts are described as diseased, adulterous, and avaricious, in other words, as afflicted by sufferings and sins similar to those of the woman in haemorrhage, the prostitute, and Zacchaeus before their repentance and redemption. These matters deserve further discussion.

One of the most frequent expressions found in Early Christian and Byzantine literature, iconophile writings included, is the comparison of sin in general and heresy in particular to a serious illness that has afflicted the soul of Christians or the Church itself.⁵⁴¹ The Acts of the ecumenical councils and treatises on dogmatic issues repeatedly speak about a “healthy” (Orthodox) or a “sick” (heretic) faith, belief, opinion, mind, person etc.⁵⁴² Heresy is described as an epidemic that spreads from one afflicted Christian to the other, or as an infectious, contagious illness that must be

⁵⁴¹ Examples in iconophile texts: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 160AB; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 377D, 548C; Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 474 (epistle 333:27); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 16 (epistle 1:463); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 117A; *Life of Nikephoros of Sevaze*, ed. Halkin (1953), 21 (§ 4); Examples in other texts: Acts of the following ecumenical councils: the first, *Mansi* II, 644D; the second, *Mansi* III, 585A; the third, *Mansi* IV, 1033C, 1045D, 1253D, 1304C; the fourth, *Mansi* VII, 833AB; the fifth, *Mansi* IX, 492D, 512B. Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1381B (Psalm 67:10); Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 104-106 (VII.1:16/18/21/37-38/45/58-59/62/66-67), 111 (VII.2:68); Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), II, 79:29, 89:7-8, IV, 155:40. For the relation of sin to sickness of both body and soul, an idea already found in the Bible, see for example Cyril of Jerusalem, *In paralyticum juxta piscinam jacentem*, PG 33, 1133A; John Chrysostom, *In paralyticum per tectum*, PG 51, 58, 60, *Sermo in paralyticum (spuria)*, PG 61, 779-80; Lampe (1961), 922, “νόσος”, 2;3.

⁵⁴² (Cf. *I. Timothy* 6:3-4 “If anyone teaches false doctrines and does not agree to the sound (lit. healthy) instruction of our Lord Jesus Christ and to godly teaching, he is conceited and understands nothing. He has an unhealthy interest in controversies and arguments that result in envy, quarrelling...”, a passage often cited in anti-heretic polemics). Examples in iconophile texts: Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 541C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 46 (§21:30-34), 69 (§31:43-44), 122 (§74:7); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 191 (epistle 71:67), 796 (532:30-31); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 453:4-5, 529:9 (on various heresies); *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 104-105 (§ 29:7-10); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 65B, 73C, 83D, 132D; *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 280C; *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1257A; *Life of Nikephoros of Sevaze*, ed. Halkin (1953), 22 (§ 4). Examples in other texts: Acts of the following ecumenical councils: the first, *Mansi* II, 657D, 760BC, 797D; the second, *Mansi* III, 557B, 561C; the third, *Mansi* IV, 897B, 1033D, 1053D, 1264E, 1376C, 1388D, *Mansi* V, 61D, 292D; the sixth, *Mansi* XI, 280B, 284E, 705D, 733E-736A.

stopped by cutting away the infected members from the body of the Church.⁵⁴³ Often heretics are called “diseased” (*νοσοῦντες*), and described as blind and deaf or crippled, because they cannot see and hear the truth of Orthodoxy, nor can they walk in the way of piety.⁵⁴⁴ The expulsion of heresy is seen as the cure of a disease, performed by the advocates of the Orthodox faith with the help of Christ the healer.⁵⁴⁵

Expressions of this kind abound in iconophile texts.⁵⁴⁶ For example, the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council compare iconoclasm to a chronic disease difficult to cure.⁵⁴⁷ In his *Apologeticus*, Patriarch Nikephoros emphasizes that when the scriptures speak about Christ’s healing miracles they refer above all to the salvation of the soul from the sickness of sin, the same sickness that in his days has afflicted iconoclasts, who were blinded, deafened and crippled by their heretic ideas.⁵⁴⁸ A

⁵⁴³ Examples in iconophile texts: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 213C, 217A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 209A, 213C, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 401C, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 12 (§6:60), 128 (§76:12), 301 (§189:33); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 3:14-16; *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 52C. Examples in other texts: Acts of the following ecumenical councils: the first, *Mansi* II, 794A; the second, *Mansi* III, 548D; the third, *Mansi* IV, 1017B, 1021A1096A, 1245C, *Mansi* V, 221BC; the fourth, *Mansi* VII, 504A; the fifth, *Mansi* IX, 409C; the sixth, *Mansi* XI, 280E, 665A, 700A, 713DE. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Meletium (Sermones)*, ed. Heil et alii (1967), 442:1-2; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 111 (VII.2:80), 118 (VIII.2:18-19); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), III, 30 (epistle 284:945-52), *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), VIII, 24:18.

⁵⁴⁴ (Cf. *Isaiah* 6:9-10 “Ye shall hear indeed, but ye shall not understand; and ye shall see indeed, but ye shall not perceive. For the heart of this people has become gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them”; *II. Corinthians* 4:3-4 “And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing. The god of this age has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they cannot see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God”; both passages often cited in anti-heretic polemics). Examples in iconophile texts: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 963E, 965A, 1150D, *Mansi* XIII, 185A, 298BC, 324E, 349E-352A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Epistola ad Leonem III papam*, PG 100, 177D-180A, *Antirrhetici I-III*, PG 100, 257B, 273C, 292A, 300B-D, 313AB, 317A, 348B, 365A, 376A, 425A/C, 465B, 480C, 489C, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 541C, 565B, 605AB, 625D, 628A, 637D, 673B-D, 709A, 749D, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 16 (§8:31-32), 18 (§9:49-50), 218 (§122:47-90), 219 (§124:16-18), 293 (§184:54-56), 297 (§186:37-39), 306 (§192:37-38), 319 (§199:19-24); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 344 (epistle 221:57), 493 (359:22), 571 (410:22-26), 587 (419:39-40), 818-19 (542:20/26-28); *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 176:635, 177:675-76, 191:1037; *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 113D. Examples in other texts: Acts of the following ecumenical councils: the third, *Mansi* IV, 624C, 637C, 672A, 1297C, *Mansi* V, 24C, 33D305D, 420B, 429DE; the fourth, *Mansi* VI, 593A, 669C, 697D, 748B, 777C, 820C, *Mansi* VII, 176B, 792E; the fifth, *Mansi* IX, 516D, 524C, 584A; the sixth, *Mansi* XI, 277C, 532B. Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 449CD, 685C, 901C, 960C, 1033C, PG 42, 16B, 32D, 36C, 48B, 221CD (all excerpts mention the “blindness” of heresy).

⁵⁴⁵ Examples in iconophile texts: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 979CD, 1127A, 1150D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 564C-D, 625D, 672A. Examples in other texts: Acts of the following ecumenical councils: the first, *Mansi* II, 660B, 873D, 921D; the second, *Mansi* III, 581D; the third, *Mansi* IV, 1017B, 1044C, 1045C, 1096A, 1296D, 1297B, 1340C; the fourth, *Mansi* VII, 476A; the sixth, *Mansi* XI, 505A, 684BC, 713CD, 988A-C, 1049C. Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 42, 188AB.

⁵⁴⁶ See the references in the previous five notes.

⁵⁴⁷ *Mansi* XII, 1018D, 1127A.

⁵⁴⁸ PG 100, 689B-D.

similar passage is found in a letter by Theodore the Studite, in which he expresses his hope that Christ will appear to cure the iconoclast disease.⁵⁴⁹ In the *Vita* of Patriarch Nikephoros and in his third *Antirrheticus*, we even find mention of iconoclasts who were said to have been afflicted by illness as a divine punishment for their heretic ideas.⁵⁵⁰

Healing miracles appear in the Chludov, Pantokrator and Paris marginal Psalters alongside Psalm 102:3, where Jesus is depicted curing blind, crippled and possessed men (figs 122).⁵⁵¹ These may again have been read as allusions to the uprooting of sin and impiety, including heresy, and implicitly iconoclasm. It is quite likely that Byzantine viewers would have been inclined to see an iconophile reference whenever the imagery reminded them of the theological rhetoric of their period. Some cases may seem far-fetched to the modern reader; but folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter is something of a paradigm of a visual text reflecting the thinking of the period, since every one of the three sinners depicted can be related to particularly characteristic expressions of the iconophile literature concerning the impious iconoclasts. So the woman with a 12-year haemorrhage can obviously be associated with the widespread description of these heretics as chronically diseased members of the Church, in need of a drastic cure that will come only with their acceptance of icon veneration (the Orthodox legality of which they are being reminded of by the tradition regarding the statue the woman herself erected in veneration of Christ).

The prostitute repenting at the feet of Christ can also be related to frequent expressions of Early Christian and Byzantine literature that identify heresy with prostitution and adultery.⁵⁵² These expressions have their origin in the scriptures, where people unfaithful to the one and only God of the Bible and prone to impiety or idolatry are likened to prostitutes who know not only one man but stray among

⁵⁴⁹ *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 690-91 (epistle 477:89-123).

⁵⁵⁰ PG 100, 116C-117A, 140C; 504D-508A. A similar case in the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, ed. Munitiz *et alii* (1997), 67 (§ 10.h).

⁵⁵¹ Chludov Psalter, folio 101v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 144r, Dufrenne (1966), 33, pl.22; Paris marginal Psalter, folio 9v, Dufrenne (1966), 44, pl. 36.

⁵⁵² Examples in: Acts of Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1105C, 1249A; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 501A, 716D; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 361D-364B, 1065B, PG 42, 752D; Patriarch Photios, *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-88), V, 229 (question 178:6-14). In psalm commentaries: on Psalm 72:27, Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 849AB, Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 1185C, Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1452D-1453A; on Psalm 105:39, Origen, *In psalmos*, PG 12, 1565CD; Hesychios, *In psalmos*, PG 39, 1300C; John Chrysostom, *In psalmos (spuria)*, PG 55, 665. See also Lampe (1961), 1122, “πορνεία” 11, “πορνεύω” 8, “πόρνη” 6.

many.⁵⁵³ Iconophile sources often use this metaphor to describe iconoclasts, who are said to have a whore's face or an adulterous mind, prone to be unfaithful to the true dogma of the Church.⁵⁵⁴ Patriarch Nikephoros and George the Monk even accuse iconoclasts of themselves being tormented by their carnal passions, suggesting that their heretic ideas result from immorality.⁵⁵⁵ Moreover, there are stories in iconophile sources about icons that made prostitutes repent⁵⁵⁶ – as well as about icons that performed healing miracles.⁵⁵⁷ In addition, a passage from the *Leimonarion*, cited three times in the treatise of John of Damascus against iconoclasts and twice in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, actually declares that iconoclasm is much worse than fornication: the story speaks about a monk tormented by the demon of carnal passion to the extent of making him agree to abandon the veneration of icons in return for freedom from sexual desire. In the end, however, he gives up this compromise, after being told by a Father that visiting all the brothels in town is preferable to stop honouring the icons of Christ and the Virgin.⁵⁵⁸

The “prostitution” of iconoclasts to heresy, as referred to in iconophile sources, can also be related to the Old Testament story of Phineas (*Numbers* 25:7-8). Angry with the Midianite whore Chasbi who had seduced the Israelites to join in idolatry of Baal, Phineas killed her and her Jewish paramour Zambri. As already mentioned (p. 99), this biblical episode was frequently cited in iconophile literature as a typological reference to cleansing the Orthodox Church from impiety and more specifically the impiety of iconoclasm. Depicting the event in all three ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters (figs 88, 90, 92) was probably intended to convey similar

⁵⁵³ Cf. Psalm 72:27 “...thou hast destroyed every one that goes a whoring from thee”; Psalm 105:39 “...and they went a whoring with their own devices”; *Isaiah* 57:3 “But draw ye near hither, ye lawless children, the seed of adulterers and the harlot”; *Jeremiah* 3:1-3 “...yet thou hast gone a-whoring with many shepherds, and hast returned to me, saith the Lord...thou hadst a whore's face, thou didst become shameless toward all”.

⁵⁵⁴ Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 545D, 553BC, 792A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 47 (§22;10), 274 (§172:14-17, quoting a passage from the *Panarion* by Epiphanius of Cyprus); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 431 (epistle 292:7-8); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 15 (epistle 1:420), 87 (37:9); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 65AB, 149D.

⁵⁵⁵ Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 220AB about Constantine V, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 465C, 488BC, 489B, 504CD, 524B (the last two about Constantine V), *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 544C, 545A; George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 746:9-10 about Leo III, 781:14-15 about Constantine V.

⁵⁵⁶ Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 13BD, 85D-89A; both examples mentioned also by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 400D-401A.

⁵⁵⁷ Like the healing miracles recorded in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 22C-24D, 57E-60B, 64B-68D, 73C-77B, 80E-85C, 89E-92B, 125A.

⁵⁵⁸ *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 124 (III.13:3-20), 165 (I.64-65;II.67-68); *Mansi* XIII, 60D-61B, 193AB.

typological allusions. Iconophile texts sometimes relate Zambri associating with an idolatrous woman and abandoning the one and only God with the “fornication” committed by the iconoclasts who also forsook the true faith through their attachment to false beliefs, and so engaged in spiritual “prostitution” in the face of the Lord.⁵⁵⁹ If Phineas killing Zambri and Chasbi is meant to allude to the defeat of iconoclasm and the punishment of the “adulterous” heretics, the repentance of the prostitute on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter may be seen as a reference to heresy being expelled from the Church not through punishment, but through forgiveness and re-admission of the sincerely repentant iconoclasts. Indeed, the return of remorseful heretics was an issue of paramount importance to the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Its whole first Act and other passages throughout the proceedings are dedicated to this issue, with the conclusion that the true repentance of iconoclasts should be accepted according to the teaching of the apostles and the Church Fathers and the example of Christ himself, who had forgiven prostitutes and tax-collectors.⁵⁶⁰ Forgiveness of repentant heretics was also a major issue after 843, when Patriarch Methodios had to deal with zealous iconophiles like the Studites, displeased with his politics of taking back in the Church so many former iconoclasts.⁵⁶¹ The ninth-century users of the Chludov Psalter must have been aware of this issue, and familiar with the description of iconoclasm as a form of “prostitution” to heresy; so they were likely to recognize relevant allusions in the figure of the prostitute on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter.

The appearance of Zacchaeus on the same page may also have been read as a reference to the repentant and forgiven iconoclasts, who in iconophile sources are constantly accused of their love of money and their acts of simony.⁵⁶² As we have seen, these accusations are visualized in three of the most polemical miniatures in the Chludov Psalter.⁵⁶³ On folio 35v the iconoclast John the Grammarian is depicted as a demoniac, holding a bag full of coins and surrounded by other containers of money, under the inspiration of an evil spirit (fig. 4). This must be the money-loving demon

⁵⁵⁹ For example, *Life of Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. Efthymiadis (1998), 150 (§ 58:5-8); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 149D.

⁵⁶⁰ *Mansi* XII, 991-1052 (1015A reference to the prodigal son, the prostitute and the thief forgiven by Christ), 1055, 1118-19, *Mansi* XIII, 61D (reference to Peter), 133BC, 364B, 426A, 475B-478D (reference to David, Manasses, prostitutes and tax-collectors). See also Giannopoulos (1988).

⁵⁶¹ See Grumel (1935), 385-393; Darrouzès (1987), 15-18. See also Methodios’ *De iis qui abnegarunt*, PG 100, 1309D (reference to Peter), 1316D; this is a text concerning the acceptance of various heretics, not only iconoclasts, back to the Orthodox Church.

⁵⁶² See pp. 31-32 above.

⁵⁶³ See pp. 50-51 above; also Corrigan (1992), 28-30.

(ΦΙΛΑΡΥΡΟC ΔΑΙΜΩΝ) who on folio 67v inspires an iconoclast priest to sell Church offices to other heretics (fig. 2). John the Grammarian appears again on folio 51v, inscribed as “second Simon and iconoclast”, trampled by Patriarch Nikephoros on a ground full of scattered coins, just like Simon Magus is being trampled by the apostle Peter right above (fig. 3). Other miniatures in the Chludov Psalter condemn avarice and praise charity: twice Christ is depicted talking to the rich man who could not enter the Kingdom of God because he would not forsake his riches (folios 11r, 52r, fig. 123),⁵⁶⁴ and on folio 35r the personification of charity gives alms to some monks, similar to the charitable man depicted on folio 116r (figs 219, 226).⁵⁶⁵

However, closer to the polemical overtone of the three miniatures that condemn the avarice of iconoclasts is the composition on folio 66r (fig. 124): there Psalm 68:10, “The zeal of your house will consume me”, is illustrated with the expulsion of the merchants and money-changers from the Temple according to *Matthew* 21:12-13 and *John* 2:14-17 (in the latter, the disciples recall Psalm 68:10 as a prophesy of the event).⁵⁶⁶ Depicting Christ driving out the dealers and overthrowing their tables and merchandise is an eloquent allusion to the expulsion of iconoclastic simony and avarice from the Church. This interpretation is supported by canon 13 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, which orders the re-consecration of churches and monasteries that in the iconoclast period were turned into taverns and other profane places. The canon closes with the citation from *John* 2:16 “Make not my father’s house into a market”, uttered by Christ after he had turned the merchants out of the Temple.⁵⁶⁷

This typological use of the event as a reference to cleansing the Church of impiety is part of a long literary tradition. For example, in his *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, Origen compares the merchants that had infested the Temple with impious bishops and prelates who are using the Church like a den of thieves, exploiting the people of God and amassing iniquitous money, and warns them that

⁵⁶⁴ *Matthew* 19:16-26; *Mark* 10:17-27; *Luke* 18:18-25.

⁵⁶⁵ Corrigan (1992), 29, 112.

⁵⁶⁶ The fragmentary inscription accompanying this miniature mentions the Gospel according to Matthew (*EK TOY KATA MATΘAION...*), and indeed the scene includes only the pigeons referred to in *Matthew* 21:13 (and *John* 2:16) and omits the sheep and oxen referred to in *John* 2:15. However, the designer of the illustration evidently knew the Christological interpretation of Psalm 68:10 in *John* 2:17, which was also repeated by psalm commentators such as Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 740, and Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 308CD.

⁵⁶⁷ *Mansi* XIII, 431DE.

Christ will come to expel them as he did in the gospels.⁵⁶⁸ The writer compares the doves sold by the merchants in the Temple to the pure Christians that are mistreated by the unworthy leaders of the Church or to the virtues of a Christian soul (the latter considered to be the temple of God), disabled by avaricious and other sinful thoughts.⁵⁶⁹ Even more relevant to our discourse is a passage from the *Liber IV contra Manichaeos* by Patriarch Photios, where the Manicheans are said to have desecrated the Church with their heretic beliefs even more drastically than the merchants profaned the Temple with their acts. Photios adds that the Manicheans are being expelled by Christ just as the merchants were in the gospels.⁵⁷⁰ To the same tradition of typological interpretation belong some later texts that further illuminate the Byzantine perception of *Matthew* 21:13-14 and *John* 2:14-17 as an allusion to contemporary Church affairs. In the eleventh century, Theophylaktos of Ochrid writes in his *Enarratio in Matthaeum* that those who sell Church offices are like the merchants selling doves in the Temple, and that those who open their thoughts to the influence of demons turn their minds, the sanctuary of God, into a den of thieves.⁵⁷¹ Both interpretations confirm that the merchants of the Temple on folio 66r of the Chludov Psalter allude to iconoclasts, since the latter were accused of selling Church offices and falling under the spell of demons both in iconophile texts and in other miniatures of the same codex. Theophylaktos comments in his *Enarratio in Joannem* that the merchants selling oxen, sheep and doves in the Temple symbolize those prelates who speculate at the expense of Christian preachers, simple-minded believers and their spiritual gifts respectively. He asserts that Christ will expel them from the Church as unworthy of priesthood, and will overturn the tables of those who preach the word of God for payment, to replace them with others.⁵⁷² To the same exegetical tradition belongs the *Commentarius in Matthaeum* by the twelfth-century writer Euthymios Zigabenos, which states that by expelling the merchants from the Temple Christ has instructed his people to protect the Church against all iniquity.⁵⁷³

All these examples suggest that the typological reading of the gospel episode in question as a reference to the cleansing of the Church from iniquity and heresy was current in Byzantine thinking, and that the Chludov Psalter reflects this. It is therefore

⁵⁶⁸ PG 13, 1444C-1453A.

⁵⁶⁹ PG 13, 1453BC.

⁵⁷⁰ PG 102, 229BC.

⁵⁷¹ PG 123, 372AB.

⁵⁷² PG 123, 1197.

⁵⁷³ PG 129, 556A.

justifiable to propose that the expulsion of the merchants from the Temple illustrating Psalm 68:10 on folio 66r of the codex was probably read in the ninth century as a visual allusion to the expulsion from the Church of the avaricious and iniquitous iconoclasts. This scene is absent from the Utrecht, the Stuttgart and the Bristol Psalters, and it is again possible that the subject came into psalter illustration in the ninth century through the iconophile circles in Constantinople.

To the same visual polemics against iconoclast avarice one could assign the figure of Zacchaeus on folio 84v, a person who as tax-collector was heavily criticised in the gospels, but at the same time, thanks to his sincere repentance, was judged worthy of forgiveness.⁵⁷⁴ He and the prostitute and the woman in haemorrhage on the same folio represent three sinners whose repentance, cure, and forgiveness may be seen as a typological allusion not only to the expulsion of heresy from the Church (the uprooting of avarice, prostitution and sickness), but also to the acceptance and salvation of the repentant iconoclasts, whose misdeeds were reminiscent, literally or typologically, of those forgiven by Christ in this miniature. Repentance is, in fact, a recurrent subject in the illustration of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters, including miniatures of the repentant David, Manasses, and Peter.⁵⁷⁵ These figures, emblematic of the value and power of repentance in Christian thought, are among those mentioned as examples to be imitated by the iconoclasts, and as proof of God's forgiveness towards remorseful sinners in iconophile texts discussing the acceptance of repentant heretics into the Church.⁵⁷⁶ Of all these miniatures it is the one on folio 84v of the Chludov Psalter that can be invested with the most pronounced iconophile allusions, thanks to its combined reference to three different cases of New Testament figures, each one of which can be linked in multiple ways to iconophile polemics. This multiplicity of references to various theological and typological arguments in iconophile literature makes this miniature one of the most complex and sophisticated examples of visual exegesis in the pages of ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters.

⁵⁷⁴ Cf. Patriarch Photios, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), VIII, 87:31-39, quoting a homily by Asterios of Amaseia on Zacchaeus.

⁵⁷⁵ David's repentance illustrating Psalm 50 on folio 50r of the Chludov Psalter (relevant text missing from the Pantokrator Psalters, Dufrenne [1966], 16); Manasses' repentance illustrating the relevant ode on folio 158v of the Chludov Psalter, and folio 220r of the Pantokrator Psalter (Dufrenne [1966], 37, pl. 32); Peter's repentance illustrating Psalm 38:13 on folio 38v of the Chludov Psalter, and folio 48r of the Pantokrator Psalter (Dufrenne [1966], 24, pl. 7). All the relevant folios are missing from the Paris marginal Psalter, Dufrenne (1966), 41.

⁵⁷⁶ See note 560 above.

The interpretation of a number of New Testament miniatures in the Chludov Psalter as instances of anti-iconoclast rhetoric and polemic has argued that sometimes it is necessary to treat the images on the same or facing pages together in order to extract the message; and indeed, the meaning of some miniatures can be fully appreciated only if they are related to others elsewhere in the manuscript. This approach has shown that the iconoclast-iconophile conflict may be manifested on nearly every page of the manuscript in one form or another. More examples of this, taken from all three ninth-century marginal psalters, will be examined in the following section, which discusses the multiplicity of references to iconophile thinking in scenes of Christ's Resurrection.

III.2 Christ's Resurrection

The second section of this chapter considers the representation of the Resurrection of Christ, the greatest of the New Testament miracles for Christian faith. This is the most frequently represented scene of any kind in the ninth-century marginal psalters, and appears in three basic iconographic types: the Anastasis (the Descent to Hades), Christ rising from the Tomb, and the Myrophores (the Holy Women at the Tomb). These scenes appear in different versions and sometimes contain unique or very rare iconographic features. Exploring the variety of sources and the complexity of meaning that lie behind these compositions reveals the high sophistication of the cultural background that was responsible for their production and use.

In the Chludov Psalter the Resurrection appears ten times,⁵⁷⁷ but originally the codex may have included two more such representations, considering the evidence of the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters.⁵⁷⁸ By comparison the Crucifixion appears only five, the Ascension four, and the Baptism three times (possibly four originally).⁵⁷⁹ In the Pantokrator Psalter the Resurrection is shown six times, the Crucifixion only twice, the Baptism three times, and the Ascension not at all.⁵⁸⁰

⁵⁷⁷ Folios 6r, 9v, 26v, 44r (twice), 63r, 63v, 78v, 82v, 100v. Folios 63r, 63v and 82v have the Anastasis, while on folio 100v Christ raises from Hades not Adam and Eve but Holy Zion. Folios 9v, 26v, 78v show Jesus rising from the Tomb. On folio 6r David appears outside the Sepulchre awaiting for the Saviour's Resurrection, while on folio 44r the scene of the Myrophores is depicted twice.

⁵⁷⁸ In the Theodore Psalter, folios 11v (fig. 151) and 146v, and in the Barberini Psalter, folios 20v and 187v, Psalms 11:6 and 106:16 are illustrated with Christ in front of his Tomb and the Anastasis respectively (Der Nersessian [1970], 20, 51, figs 21, 235; Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989], 64, 128). Since these two eleventh-century codices are reasonably considered indirect copies of the Chludov Psalter, the miniatures in question could reproduce compositions of now lost folios from the ninth-century manuscript. (According to Corrigan [1992], 143, the text of Ps. 11:6 in the Chludov Psalter is missing. She also estimates a loss of text between 106:23-40, that could probably extend from 106:16 onwards (as says Walter [1986], 274, n. 20). That this psalm could have been illustrated with a scene of the Resurrection in the Chludov Psalter is further sustained by the fact that in the Paris marginal Psalter, folio 19v, Ps. 106:13-14 is illustrated with such a scene. Similarly, Psalm 11:6 is also illustrated with a scene of Christ rising from the Tomb on folio 26v of the Pantokrator Psalter. Dufrenne [1966], 45, pl. 43; 23, pl. 4.)

⁵⁷⁹ The Crucifixion is depicted on folios 19r, 20r, 45v, 67r, 72v, the Ascension on folios 14r, 22r, 46v, 55v and the Baptism on folios 72v, 75v, 117r. Initially Psalm 28:3, now missing according to Corrigan (1992), 143, may have been illustrated with a miniature of the Baptism, judging by the evidence of the Theodore and Barberini Psalters, which include such a scene in relation to this psalm on folios 31r and 47v respectively (Der Nersessian [1970], 25, fig. 52; Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989], 72-73).

⁵⁸⁰ The Anastasis is shown on folio 83r, the Myrophores on folio 112r and Christ rising from the Tomb on folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r. The Crucifixion appears on folios 10r and 98r. The Baptism is depicted on folios 98v and 164v, while on folio 3v of cod. Petropolitanus 265 (consisting of folios cut out from

Considering the evidence of the Chludov Psalter, the missing folios of the Pantokrator Psalter may have included one more scene of the Resurrection, the Crucifixion and the Baptism, but even so the figures speak for themselves.⁵⁸¹ In the Paris marginal Psalter so many folios are missing that a statistic of this kind is impossible.⁵⁸² Currently it has the Resurrection and the Baptism once each.⁵⁸³

In other words, in the two best-preserved ninth-century marginal psalters the Resurrection appears at least twice as often as the Crucifixion, Ascension or Baptism, which are the next most frequently represented Christological scenes. This is an important fact, perhaps obscured by previous studies which have treated the Resurrection together with the Passion cycle as a whole. Grabar and Kartsonis for example saw the great number of miniatures concerning Christ's Passion and Resurrection in the marginal psalters as related to the iconophile justification of the Saviour's depiction in icons as a result of his Incarnation, manifested by his suffering and death.⁵⁸⁴ As we have seen already, iconophile literature proclaimed Christ's depiction in images as both result and proof of his becoming Man,⁵⁸⁵ and that his Incarnation is proved by his human attributes, feelings, and experiences.⁵⁸⁶ One of the strongest proofs of Christ's human, and therefore representable nature, was his suffering and death.⁵⁸⁷ The depiction of his Passion and Entombment in the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters is therefore an iconophile statement of his representability based on his Incarnation and death. Although these codices include an

the Pantokrator Psalter), in relation to Psalm 76:17, which in the Chludov Psalter is illustrated with the Baptism, appears Jesus next to personifications of two rivers, accompanied by the inscription "Christ at the Jordan and the other waters", Dufrenne (1966), 21, 23, 26-27, 28, 30, 34, pls. 1, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 16, 25.

⁵⁸¹ For the missing folios of the Pantokrator Psalter in general see Dufrenne (1966), 15-16. Psalm 43:24/27, illustrated with two scenes of the Myrophores in the Chludov Psalter, and Psalm 45:7, illustrated with the Crucifixion in the same manuscript, are now missing from the Pantokrator Psalter. The latter lacks also Psalm 28:3, missing as well in the Chludov Psalter, but illustrated with the Baptism in the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters (see n. 579 above), suggesting that such a scene could have been initially included in both the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters.

⁵⁸² See p. 28, n. 16 above.

⁵⁸³ Folios 19v and 26v respectively (Dufrenne [1966], 45-46, pls. 43, 45).

⁵⁸⁴ Grabar (1980-81), 11-16; Grabar (1984), 239-242; Kartsonis (1986), 138, 228-29. See also Corrigan (1992), 88-89.

⁵⁸⁵ See p. 40, n. 59.

⁵⁸⁶ See pp. 123-24, n. 406.

⁵⁸⁷ Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* V, 81B, 128AB, 184E, 429A; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 377BC, 405AB; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 173-74 (X.2.5:55-59), 176 (X.6:18), 250-51 (XIII.9:78-100) 317-18 (XXIV:70-75); John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 163 (64, III.20:26-27); Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 279 (§175:52-55); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 332B, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 99, 404AB, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 449CD, 452B, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 344-45 (epistle 221:62), 731 (496:13-24). See also pp. 166 (n. 591), 178 (n. 649) below.

extended Passion cycle with episodes before Christ's death (the Last Supper, the washing of the feet, Gethsemane, the arrest, Peter's denial, Jesus before the high priests and the mocking),⁵⁸⁸ the extraordinary emphasis on the representation of the Resurrection points to some deeper explanation. Why is Christ's victory over death so much more emphasized than his human submission to it?

In the scenes of the Anastasis, Christ rising from the Tomb, and the Myrophores, as much emphasis is placed on Christ's human death and suffering as on his human and divine natures united in one hypostasis. According to Early Christian and Byzantine Orthodox theology, while the dead body of Jesus lay in the Sepulchre and his human soul descended to Hades, his divine nature was united with both, preserving the body from the decay of death and finally reuniting it with the soul in Christ's Resurrection.⁵⁸⁹ Of course, the divinity was present also in his suffering on the Cross, but, because of its very subject, the Crucifixion places greater emphasis on Christ's human nature, especially when he is depicted hanging dead on the Cross, as on folios 45v and 72v of the Chludov Psalter.⁵⁹⁰ The representations of the Resurrection on the other hand stress man's triumph over death through Christ's divine nature.⁵⁹¹ Consequently, the frequency with which the Resurrection is represented in the Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters cannot be explained only as the result of a polemical iconophile intention to confirm Christ's humanity in order to justify his representability in images, as Grabar and Kartsonis have argued. The full explanation is more complicated.

The issues are best treated by starting with folio 67v of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 2). At the top of the page, the guards at Christ's Tomb are shown accepting bribes

⁵⁸⁸ The Entombment: folios 87r (Chludov) and 122r (Pantokrator). The Last Supper: folio 40v (Chludov). The washing of the feet: folios 50v (Chludov), 63r (Pantokrator). The prayer in Gethsemane: folios 66v, 113r (Chludov). The arrest: folios 38r, 54v (Chludov), 48r, 68v (Pantokrator). Peter's denial: folios 37v, 38v (Chludov), 48r (Pantokrator). Christ before the high priests: folios 31v (Chludov), 39v (Pantokrator). The mocking of Christ: folio 19v (Chludov).

⁵⁸⁹ Kartsonis (1986), 35-39.

⁵⁹⁰ On folios 45v (fig. 210) and 72v (fig. 66) Christ is shown on the cross with his eyes closed (sign of his death), while on folio 67r (fig. 1) his eyes are probably open (sign that he is still alive), as on folios 10r and 98v of the Pantokrator Psalter (Kartsonis [1986], 127; Dufrenne [1966], 21, 28, pls. 1, 12). For the theology of Christ's death on the cross and relative depictions in Byzantine art see Kartsonis (1986), 33-39, 40-54, 67-68.

⁵⁹¹ It is commonplace in Early Christian and Byzantine theology to state that Christ died as man and arose as God, in the sense that the former event emphasizes his human nature and the latter his divine nature (and therefore both events prove the hypostatic union of his two natures). Examples in: Meliton of Sardis, *On Easter*, SC 123, 62:19-20, 64:56-58; Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, IV, 677D; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 261D, 433A; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), III, 70/72 (epistle 284:2326-29/2390-97).

from the Jews so they will lie about Jesus' Resurrection and say that his disciples had stolen his body. On the lower part of the page an iconoclast priest inspired by a "money-loving demon"⁵⁹² sells church offices to two other heretics. Both miniatures illustrate Psalm 68:28-29: "Add iniquity to their iniquity and let them not know your justice. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and let them not be written with the righteous." The inscription accompanying the soldiers at the Sepulchre reads "... they lied for money and they added one iniquity to another", (first plotting the Crucifixion and then denying the Resurrection).⁵⁹³ The inscription below the heretics declares that "...and while they were desecrating Christ's icon, they were performing an additional iniquity", (their crime is iconoclasm *and* simony).⁵⁹⁴

This illustrated page follows folio 67r, where an analogy is made between the Jews who crucified Christ and the heretics who destroy his icon (fig.) – as based on iconophile literature describing the iconoclasts as the new crucifiers of the Lord, submitting his icons to a second Passion and denying his Incarnation (see pages 30-31). A similar comparison is made on folio 67v, but the idea seems to be derived directly from folio 67r rather than from iconophile literature, where I can find no such phrasing. However, the message of the miniatures on folio 67v is based on a line of thought quite commonplace in iconophile polemics. The first scene emphasizes two things: that the guards at Christ's grave had witnessed his Resurrection, but chose to deny it for a handful of coins; and that the Jews who bribed them did not recognize Christ as the Messiah and that this was why they wanted him crucified, but over and above that, they denied his Resurrection which incontrovertibly proves him to be the Incarnated Logos, both perfect man and perfect God. Similarly in the second scene, the iconoclast priests did not guard the Orthodox faith, but rather denied Christ's Incarnation by rejecting the veneration of the icons, and moreover they also engaged in the iniquity of simony.⁵⁹⁵ In other words, the iconoclasts are presented not only as Jewish-minded and as simoniacs – in accordance with frequent expressions in iconophile literature;⁵⁹⁶ but, since with their rejection of Christ's icons they deny the fact that God became man in Jesus, so they also seem to deny that Christ died in order to rise again and bring salvation to humanity. In short: the rejection of icons, or their

⁵⁹² ΦΙΛΑΡΓΥΡΟΣ ΔΑΙΜΩΝ, according to the inscription.

⁵⁹³ ΔΙΑ ΑΡΓΥΡΙΑ ΕΨΕΥCΑΝΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟCΕΘΗΚΑΝ ΑΝΟΜΙΑΝ ΕΙΣΙ ΑΝΟΜΙΑΝ.

⁵⁹⁴ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΧΥ ΕΙΚΟΝΑ ΑΤΙΜΑΖΟΝΤΟ ΠΡΟCΘΗΚΗΝ ΤΗC ΑΝΟΜΙΑC ΑΥΤΩΝ ΕΡΤΑΖΟΝΤΟ. See also n. 595.

⁵⁹⁵ The word *CIMONIAI* has been read by Ščepkina at the first part of the surviving inscription below the figures.

⁵⁹⁶ See pp. 31 (n. 26), 102 (n. 322) above.

equation to idols, leads to the denial of Christ's birth, death, and return to everlasting life, and so invalidates Christ's mission. This was, indeed, a widely held iconophile view, and the Chludov miniature makes that very point.⁵⁹⁷ Can this idea be related to the frequent representation of Christ's Resurrection in the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalter?

The insistence with which the Saviour's victory over death is depicted in the ninth-century marginal psalters may be seen as an intention to highlight the focal event in the salvation of mankind, that could be declared only if one believes in the venerability of Christ's icons, or else in the truth of his Incarnation. The frequent appearance of the Resurrection in the margins of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters can, therefore, be seen as a celebration of the dogmatic, didactic and salvational value of icons. In the repeated representation of this Christological episode is condensed and emphasized all the iconophile and Orthodox theology concerning the Incarnation of the Logos for the salvation of mankind through the triumph of Christ over death.

At the heart of this theology of salvation lies the dogma of Christ's unconfused and undivided two natures, human and divine, hypostatically united in one person. Jesus became the intercessor between man and God exactly because he was both perfect man and perfect God.⁵⁹⁸ The representation of his Resurrection is the most eloquent visual manifestation of this dogma, given that through his divine power Jesus overcame the death he experienced with his human body and soul. In other words, an image of the Resurrection bears very important connotations for the Christian faith in general, and for the issue of icon veneration in particular.⁵⁹⁹ The greatest demonstration of Christ's divinity was the miraculous event of his Resurrection.⁶⁰⁰ Pictures of it emphasize more than does anything else the iconophile

⁵⁹⁷ Examples in: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 229A-C, 412A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 704D-705A, 809A-812A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 6/7 (§4:6/35), 13 (§7:17-18), 16 (§8:44), 20 (§11:14-19), 28 (§14:16-17); Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 445A-C, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 232 (epistle 113:18-20); *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1247A. See also Brubaker (1989a), 33 ff.

⁵⁹⁸ Kartsonis (1986), 35-36.

⁵⁹⁹ The most extensive analysis on the subject up to now can be found in Kartsonis (1986), esp. 40ff., and 227 ff. One of the most eloquent Byzantine sources on this matter is the *Viae Dux* by Anastasios of Sinai (ed. Uthermann [1981], esp. 248-51 [XIII.9]; commented by Kartsonis [1986], 40 ff.).

⁶⁰⁰ For the importance of the Anastasis and of its representations as proof of Christ's double nature see especially Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 81 (III.2:12-15), 248-51 (XIII.9), 311 (XXIII.2:82-4). John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 216 (91, IV.18:116-18), quotes *Romans* 1:4, "(Christ) through the Spirit of holiness was declared with power to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead", and insists that Christ manifested himself to be the Son of God through

claim that the dogma of the Saviour's two natures is fully respected and even theologically attested by his representation in icons. By their very subject, the scenes of Christ's Resurrection manifest the hypostatic union of his representable humanity and his invisible divinity in the most eloquent way. The importance of the dogma of Christ's two natures in iconophile literature (as a response to the iconoclast accusations already mentioned on pages 121-23) would explain why his Resurrection, the scene emblematic of this dogma, is the most frequently shown New Testament event in the psalters.

The two basic iconographic types of the Resurrection in the ninth-century marginal psalters, Christ rising from the Tomb and the Anastasis, will be further examined in order to unravel additional iconophile connotations, and to pinpoint the literary sources that may have inspired their depiction.

III.2.1 Christ rising from the Tomb (Chludov Psalter, folios 9v, 26v, 78v; Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r)

The most frequently represented type of the Resurrection in the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters is Christ rising from the Tomb. Three (and initially perhaps four) times in the Chludov Psalter, and four times in the Pantokrator Psalter, Jesus is shown either emerging from his Tomb or standing outside it.⁶⁰¹ David (who according to patristic exegesis prophesied the Resurrection in his psalms) normally appears beside Christ and so validates the visual interpretation of the text (figs 125, 127, 140, 149).⁶⁰² Sometimes the guards or the Myrophores are witnesses of the event (figs 125, 126, 128).⁶⁰³ This iconography for the Resurrection is very rare in Byzantine art, the

his miracles, the Resurrection and the descent of the Holy Ghost. For the importance of the Resurrection as Christ's miracle *par excellence* in the gospel narrative see Sahas (1986), 157, n. 34.

⁶⁰¹ Chludov Psalter, folios 9v, 26v, 78v. Judging by the evidence of the Theodore and Barberini Psalter (folios 11v and 20v respectively), Christ rising from the Tomb could have been initially depicted also in relation to Psalm 11:6, now missing from the Chludov Psalter (see p. 164, n. 578 above). Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r.

⁶⁰² Chludov Psalter, folios 9v, 26v, 78v; Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v. That in these miniatures David does not appear simply as the author of the psalms, but as the advocate of their Christian (and at times overtly iconophile) interpretation is discussed by Corrigan (1992), 62 ff., where more examples of Christological scenes including the figure of David are also mentioned.

⁶⁰³ The guards appear in the Chludov Psalter, folio 26v and in the Pantokrator Psalter, folios 30v and 109r, in the last case together with the Myrophores. There are more miniatures where the soldiers

usual types for the representation of the event being the Anastasis or the Holy Women at the Tomb. In fact, the iconography of Christ rising from the Tomb appears only in the ninth-century Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters, in the dependent eleventh-century Bristol, Theodore and Barberini Psalters,⁶⁰⁴ and in the fourteenth-century Hamilton Psalter that belongs to the same recession.⁶⁰⁵ Most likely the scene was invented for the ninth-century psalters.⁶⁰⁶

The most obvious observations about this have already been made in earlier pages. Taking as examples a miniature where David appears behind the resurrected Christ (as on folio 26v of the Pantokrator Psalter, fig. 127) and a miniature where the Myrophores and the guards at the Tomb are depicted at the Saviour's feet (as on folio 109r of the Pantokrator Psalter, fig. 126), one can make two comments on the possible iconophile allusions of the scene, and these also apply to other Christological scenes of the ninth-century marginal psalters. Firstly, David is shown as an eye-witness of the Resurrection at the Tomb. David's presence expresses the iconophile argument that what was seen by the Old Testament prophets in their iconic visions of Christ could and should be represented in the visionary icons of the Orthodox Church, since the Old Testament prophesies were fulfilled in the New Testament through the Incarnation of the Logos.⁶⁰⁷ Corrigan correctly observed that this argument applies to all the miniatures where a prophet appears in a Christological episode, or with the figure of Christ or his icon.⁶⁰⁸ In like vein, when the Myrophores or the guards are represented next to Jesus, they too are eye-witnesses of his Resurrection, but actual historical ones, and as such reflect the iconophile argument that what can be actually observed through the eyes can be also depicted in images. It is a *topos* in iconophile literature to claim that since Christ was seen and touched by people, he could be represented in icons.⁶⁰⁹

and/or the Myrophores appear next to Christ's Tomb, suggesting the event of the Resurrection, while Christ himself is omitted (Chludov Psalter, folios 6r, 44r, 67v [figs 142, 102, 2]; Pantokrator Psalter, folios 89r, 112r).

⁶⁰⁴ Christ is depicted coming out from or standing in front of his Tomb in: the Bristol Psalter, folio 21v (Dufrenne [1966], 55, pl. 49); the Theodore Psalter, folios 10r (fig. 150), 11v (fig. 151), 32v, 55v, 105v (Der Nersessian [1970], 20, 26, 30, 42, figs 18, 21, 55, 90, 173); the Barberini Psalter, folios 18v, 20v, 49v 136v (Anderson – Canart – Walter [1989], 63, 64, 74, 108).

⁶⁰⁵ Folios 80v, 153r (Havice [1978], 395, 431). For the appearance of the scene of Christ rising from the Tomb only in the marginal Psalters in Byzantine art see Kartsonis (1986), 131-134.

⁶⁰⁶ Cf. Kartsonis (1986), 131-34.

⁶⁰⁷ See pp. 40 (n. 60), 52 (n. 100).

⁶⁰⁸ Corrigan (1992), 62-75.

⁶⁰⁹ See p. 152, n. 533, where most of the passages cited mention together Christ's human tangible and visible nature. For specific iconophile references only to his visible human nature as an argument in

This argument can be related to all the Christological episodes where Jesus appears accompanied by other figures. However, the case of eye-witnesses to Christ's rising from the Tomb deserves a further comment. In *Matthew* 28:1-4/8-9, Christ's Resurrection was followed by the descent of an angel who rolled back the stone from the entrance of the grave, causing the guards such fear that "they shook and became like dead men". The angel announced to the two Myrophores the Lord's Resurrection, and on their way back to Jerusalem the two women saw Christ greeting them, and held his feet in veneration. On folio 26v of the Chludov Psalter and folios 30v and 109r of the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 125, 126, 128) Christ is shown standing outside his Tomb in the presence of the guards, who appear "like dead men" not because they saw the angel of *Matthew* 28:2-4, but Jesus himself; and in the latter miniature (fig. 126) the two Myrophores of the Chairete are also shown prostrate and touching Christ's feet, right outside his Tomb. It seems, therefore, that these three miniatures deviate from the gospel narrative, condensing the events in order to emphasize Christ's tangible and visible human nature immediately after his Resurrection.

More specific in this iconography is the Tomb itself and how Christ is related to it.⁶¹⁰ To appreciate the particularity of this element one has to look at the closest surviving approximations of the subject, mainly in pre-iconoclastic art. In the ivory of the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich, Jesus ascending to heaven appears on the right of his Sepulchre, which is shown in the form of a late antique mausoleum (fig. 129).⁶¹¹ Closer to our miniatures is the ivory from the Castello Sforzesco in Milan (fig. 130).⁶¹² According to Weitzmann, the angel announcing the Resurrection to the Myrophores in front of the open doors of the Tomb has been re-interpreted as being Christ himself, by adding a halo and a scroll in his left hand.⁶¹³ These ivories are datable to the beginning of the fifth century, and probably were made in Rome.

favour of his representability see examples in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 164D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 292A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 161 (§91:11-12); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus II*, PG 99, 384D, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 444C, 452B, 472D. Brubaker (1999), 302, relates the scene of the Chairete (Christ greeting the Myrophores according to *Matthew* 28:9) on folio 30v of cod. Paris. gr. 510 to the ability of human witnesses to see the divinity and attest to the humanity of Christ and therefore to his representability in images. See also pp. 173-74 below for Christ's tangible and visible nature even after his Resurrection.

⁶¹⁰ Part of the following analysis has been presented at the Twentieth Symposium of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Archaeology and Art of the Christian Archaeological Society in Athens (abstract in Evangelatou [2000]); and more extensively at the International Symposium "Relics in the Art and Culture of the Eastern Christian World", Moscow 2000 (Evangelatou forthcoming).

⁶¹¹ *Rom und Byzanz* (1998), 84-90, cat. no. 9.

⁶¹² Vollbach (1952), no. 111, pl. 33; *Age of Spirituality* (1979), 504-505, cat. no. 453.

⁶¹³ Weitzmann (1966), 317-325, esp. 321 ff., pl. 81b.

The Syrian Rabbula Gospels of 586⁶¹⁴ has on folio 13r Christ greeting the Myrophores a few steps away from his Sepulchre (fig. 131). Through its open doors streams the divine light of the Resurrection, suggesting that Jesus has just come out of his grave.⁶¹⁵ A similar impression is created by the miniature of the Chairete in the Constantinopolitan cod. Paris. gr. 510 (879 - 882):⁶¹⁶ in the lower register of folio 30v Christ greeting the Holy Women appears close to the cave of his burial (fig. 132).

Compared to the above, the ninth-century miniatures of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 125-128, 140) are much more emphatic and straightforward representations of Christ rising from the Tomb. The viewers themselves are witnesses of the Resurrection, not of Christ greeting the Myrophores with the empty Tomb in the background. By representing him beside his grave, the psalters emphasize the historical truth of his burial in the precise location of the Holy Sepulchre. This is the point of showing the Tomb – which is absent from the traditional Anastasis.

This visual emphasis on spatially relating Christ to his Sepulchre can be linked to a basic argument of eight- and ninth-century iconophile literature, particularly highlighted in the works of Patriarch Nikephoros. This is the tenet that Christ is representable (*γραπτός*) because through his Incarnation he became circumscribable (*περιγραπτός*) – he acquired a human body delimited in time and space.⁶¹⁷ In Byzantine theology generally, and in iconophile texts, one of the most frequently cited proofs of Christ's circumscribable (and thus representable) nature is his bodily burial for three days in the confined location of the Holy Sepulchre – circumscription in time and space.⁶¹⁸ It is this circumscription that the ninth-century marginal-psalter miniatures emphasize when they show Jesus next to his Tomb.

⁶¹⁴ Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, cod. Plut. I, 56 (Cecchelli – Furlani – Salmi [1959], 70-71).

⁶¹⁵ Kartsonis (1986), 22.

⁶¹⁶ Omont (1929), 13 ff., pl. 21; Brubaker (1999), 299-302, fig. 7.

⁶¹⁷ This argument is particularly emphasized in the first and second *Antirrheticus* by Patriarch Nikephoros, PG 100, 236-372 and in his *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 31 (§15:10-16), 35 (§16:79-81), 36-37 (§16:96-120), 86-91 (§39:36-40/85), 95 (§47:11-14), 99 (§56:9-18), 234-7 (§143:18-144:64). Other examples in: John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 126 (III.17:7); Acts of the 7th Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 253C-E, 337D-340B; Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 460A. See also Parry (1996), 99-113; and p. 153, n. 536 above.

⁶¹⁸ It is commonplace in Byzantine hymns and homilies on Christ's death and Resurrection to express amazement about the fact that while his divine nature is omnipresent, his human one had been confined for three days in the Holy Sepulchre. For example, in a homily by Proclus of Constantinople on the Incarnation, included in the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, it is exclaimed that the one who had created heaven was enclosed in the Tomb (*Mansi* IV, 585E). In the 6th hymn of Romanos Melodos on the Resurrection, the Tomb is the place blessed to contain the one that not even heavens can contain

The psalm verses illustrated with these images make a general reference to the Resurrection,⁶¹⁹ that could equally well be shown in a scene of the Myrophores or of the Anastasis, which do appear in other folios of the psalters.⁶²⁰ It is the planner of the illustration who chose the particular imagery of Christ rising from the Tomb. He decided to emphasize the Tomb because, according to Early Christian and Byzantine theology, this was the physical location of the burial of the incarnated God's human body imbued with divinity (ἡ θεόσωμος ταφή),⁶²¹ whence Christ rose as God and man (ὁ θεάνθρωπος) in all the glory of his perfect divine and human natures. With this in mind, one can propose a specific and pointed iconophile connotation for the iconography of Christ rising from the Tomb. In this form, the Resurrection becomes a statement of the unconfused and undivided unity of Christ's human and divine natures, hypostatically united in the perfect God and man risen from the grave. It shows that Christ retained his circumscribable and thus representable body even after his Resurrection, contrary to certain iconoclast allegations that claimed the opposite, i.e. that after his Resurrection Christ's human body became immaterial and divine, therefore uncircumscribable and non-representable in images.⁶²² The iconophiles

(ed. Maas – Trypanis [1963], 230 [17:6]). A wide range of similar rhetorical antitheses appear in the hymns that were sung in the offices of the Holy Week in Jerusalem, according to the *Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis* preserved in a twelfth century codex, attesting to an earlier tradition (Papadopoulos-Kerameus [1891-98], II, 156:27-28, 157:1-2, 159:25-26, 160:8-15, 163:11-15, 163:18-21, 166:14-15, 168:18-24, 171:19-22, 171:29-32, 172:3-4, 174:16-18, 175:2-3, 176:23, 187:3, 231:2-3, 232:5, 239:1, 250:6-5). Analogous expressions in the homily of patriarch Germanos on the burial of Christ, PG 98, 269C. See also the emphasis on the miraculous nature of the Tomb because of Christ's circumscription in it by Patriarch Photios, *Homilies*, ed. Laourdas (1959), 118-120 (homily XI, *On Holy Saturday*, §7; trans. Mango [1958], 208-210). Regarding polemical iconophile texts, the Holy Sepulchre is mentioned as place of Christ's circumscription, for example, in the *Antirrhetici* of Patriarch Nikephoros, PG 100, 313C, 332D, 365D, 368A, 437C, and in his *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 99 (§56:9-18), 281 (§178:1-14), in the first case citing an excerpt from Amphilochios of Iconium and in the second mentioning Epiphanius of Cyprus.

⁶¹⁹ Psalm 9:33 (Chludov Psalter, folio 9v, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 24v), "Arise, O Lord God"; Psalm 11:6 (Pantokrator Psalter, folio 26v), "Because of the misery of the poor, and because of the sighing of the needy, now will I arise"; Psalm 30:5-7 (Chludov Psalter, folio 26v, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 30v), "Thou shalt bring me out of the snare which they have hidden for me; for thou, O Lord, art my defender..."; Psalm 77:65 (Chludov Psalter, folio 78v, Pantokrator Psalter, folio 109r), "So the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, and as a mighty man who has been heated with wine".

⁶²⁰ For example, the Myrophores in the Chludov Psalter, folio 44r (Psalm 43:27 "Arise, O Lord, help us, and redeem us for thy name's sake", fig. 102); and in the Pantokrator Psalter, folio 112r (Psalm 79:3 "Stir up thy power and come to deliver us"). The Anastasis in the Chludov Psalter, folio 63 (Psalm 67:2 "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered", fig. 191), and folio 82v (Psalm 81:8 "Arise, O God, judge the earth", fig. 186).

⁶²¹ For example, ἡ θεόσωμος ταφή is a term used in the title of homilies on the Easter Saturday by authors such as Patriarch Germanos, PG 98, 244B, and Patriarch Photios, ed. Laourdas (1959), 105 (homily XI, trans. Mango [1958], 193 ff.).

⁶²² The iconoclast statement is recorded by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG100, 437B, and Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus II*, PG 99, 381C.

rejected this by stressing the Orthodox dogma that after the Resurrection Christ did retain his human body, with the difference that now it was freed from the physical needs of hunger, thirst, sleep etc. While completely purified, it was still visible, tangible, delimited in time and space and thus representable, as the gospel narratives after his Resurrection and until his Ascension prove.⁶²³ To show Christ rising from the Tomb, especially before eye-witnesses like the Myrophores or the guards, substantiates the iconophile claim that Christ's material body could and should be represented even after his Resurrection, Jesus being not only perfect God but perfect man as well.

In the Chludov Psalter the Tomb is shown in two types in the scene of Christ's bodily rising: in the form of the Holy Sepulchre in the Church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem (type A – also used in the Pantokrator Psalter – figs 125-128, 140), and in a ciborium-topped construction (type B, fig. 149). It is important to ask why these two types appear, and whether they have any significance.

*Christ's Tomb as the Holy Sepulchre (type A – Chludov Psalter, folios 26v, 78v;
Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r)*

In the Resurrection scenes illustrating the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters the Tomb is never depicted in the form of the rock-cut cave where Jesus was buried, as in cod. Paris. gr. 510 (fig. 132),⁶²⁴ nor is it a general type of late-antique mausoleum as in the pre-iconoclastic ivories and the Rabbula Gospels (figs 129-131).⁶²⁵ The only cases in which the Tomb is shown as the gospel cave are the two miniatures of Christ's Entombment, on folios 87r and 122r of the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters respectively (figs 133-34). In the majority of cases where the Tomb appears in Resurrection scenes (the bribing of the guards, the Myrophores at the Tomb, the arisen Christ, or David awaiting the Resurrection, figs 2, 125-28, 140,

⁶²³ Examples by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrhethici II-III*, PG 100, 368BC, 437BC, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 226 (§131:15-25), 280 (§175:78-83), 283 (§178:14-41); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus II*, PG 99, 384A-388A, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 344 (epistle 221:63-68), 663 (463:56-58). See also Parry (1996), 102-104, 112-13; Kartsonis (1986), 141.

⁶²⁴ See p. 172 above.

⁶²⁵ See pp. 171-72 above. For the bibliography on the representation of Christ's Tomb as mausoleum in pre-iconoclastic art see Kartsonis (1986), 22, n. 21.

142), the Sepulchre is shown as a narrow tall building with a central opening and a conical roof.⁶²⁶ This type of construction (type A) is fairly clearly connected with the abundant visual and literary evidence about the form of the Holy Sepulchre as modelled from Constantine's time onwards and still preserved in the ninth century.⁶²⁷

Pilgrim flasks (dated around 600) from the Holy Land offer comparative material. On many of these ampullae, Christ's Tomb is depicted as the Holy Sepulchre in various more or less detailed versions.⁶²⁸ Ampulla number 18 from Bobbio has the Edicule with a form and proportions very similar to that of the Sepulchre in the marginal-psalter miniatures (fig. 135).⁶²⁹ Other ampullae show more architectural details of the actual monument (fig. 136), but the general shape remains the same, as is immediately evident from looking at the designs of the most characteristic representations collected by Wilkinson.⁶³⁰ The forms of the Tomb in the marginal psalters are closer to those on the pilgrim flasks that Wilkinson calls the "summary form" or "type A" (fig. 137).⁶³¹ Some of these flasks seem to render the facade of the Edicule without the columns that run around it, as in the psalter miniatures.⁶³² The outline is that of a rectangular structure topped by a triangular roof, as in the miniatures. The miniatures, however, have also elements obviously intended to suggest the conical form of the Sepulchre roof, as in the variations of the more detailed version of the Tomb ("types B and C" according to Wilkinson), that appear on other pilgrim flasks (fig. 144).⁶³³

⁶²⁶ In the Chludov Psalter: folios 26v, 78v (Christ rising from the Tomb, figs 125, 140), 6r (David awaits the Resurrection outside the Sepulchre, fig. 142), 67v (bribing of the guards, fig. 2). In the Pantokrator Psalter: folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 109r (Christ rising from the Tomb, figs 26-28), 112r (the Myrophores), 89r (bribing of the guards). Another version of this building appears on folio 44r of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 102) where it is shown twice, with the same dimensions as before, but with a cupola instead of a cone at its top. Could this be a vague reference to the Anastasis Rotunda, the most characteristic element of which in *locus sanctus art* is its dome? See, for example, Bobbio ampullae 15, 16, Grabar (1958), pl. XLV; the Sancta Sanctorum reliquary box, Biddle (1999), 22, fig. 17, and n. 13 for further bibliography on the object; and an ampulla similar to those of Bobbio, in the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Collection, Vikan (1982), 19-21, fig. 13b and back cover.

⁶²⁷ For the architectural history of the Holy Sepulchre see Wilkinson (1972), 83-97, Biddle (1999), 20-28, 53-73.

⁶²⁸ Grabar (1958), 18 ff., 34 ff. (flask nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8-15 from Monza; and 3-7, 15, 16, 18 from Bobbio, plates V, IX-XIV, XVI, XVII, XXIV, XXVIII, XXXIV, XXXVIII, XL, XLV, XLVII, XLVIII).

⁶²⁹ Grabar (1958), pl. XLVII, detail on pl. XLVIII.

⁶³⁰ Wilkinson (1972), 92-3, figs 9-11. Also Barag – Wilkinson (1974), 179-187, fig. 1.

⁶³¹ Wilkinson (1972), 92-3, figs 9, 11; Barag – Wilkinson (1974), fig. 2.

⁶³² Flasks nos. 2, 6, 10, 11 from Monza, Grabar (1958), pls. V, XII, XVI, XVIII; Barag – Wilkinson (1974), figs 1-2 (the first three designs in each figure).

⁶³³ Wilkinson (1972), 92-3, fig. 10; Barag – Wilkinson (1974), figs 3-4. Flask nos. 3, 5, and 9 from Monza, and 7 from Bobbio, Grabar (1958), pls. IX, XI, XIV, XL; also on flask nos. 12-15 from Monza and 3-5 from Bobbio, Grabar (1958), XXII, XXIV, XXVXXXVIII, XXXIV-XXXVI, where the form of

In comparison with Wilkinson's reconstruction of the Constantinian Sepulchre (fig. 138), which he based on the surviving visual and literary evidence,⁶³⁴ it is obvious that none of the pictorial renderings of the construction that have been preserved to our day in various media can be called realistic. Only the Narbonne model (fig. 139), dated before the tenth century, roughly fits our notion of realism,⁶³⁵ which was not shared, however, by the Byzantine viewers. They would have considered a representation of the Sepulchre on ampullae or other objects "truthful" and "life-like" as long as it included at least some of the building's basic architectural elements. Even in a conventional version these elements would render the construction recognizable and identifiable with the Holy Tomb in the Church of the Anastasis.⁶³⁶

The Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters do offer recognizable elements, since they include two basic characteristics of the actual site mentioned in the description of the Edicule by Patriarch Photios: the conical roof and the Tomb's dimensions.⁶³⁷ The most important element is the conical roof of the Constantinian structure,⁶³⁸ which in

the Sepulchre is more complicated, with a central part that Wilkinson categorizes under his "type A", flanked by columns supporting a conical roof as in his "types B and C" (see fig. 144).

⁶³⁴ Wilkinson (1972), 83-4, 91-7, pl. X.

⁶³⁵ This marble, three-dimensional representation of the Holy Sepulchre has helped scholars in the reconstruction of the Constantinian Edicule, although it does not seem to be absolutely faithful to the original structure. See Wilkinson (1972), 93-5, figs 12, 13; Biddle (1999), 22, 69, 100, figs 16, 64C, 100.

⁶³⁶ That the Byzantines considered their art "life-like", but not in our sense of literal and pictorial realism (for which no Byzantine term existed) is extensively discussed by James – Webb (1991), 1-17. It is suggested that images and their descriptions were principally appraised not for their accuracy or aesthetics, but for their ability to convey a deeper spiritual message. The term "life-like" could simply mean for the Byzantines that an image followed recognisable conventions (cf. Kazhdan – Maguire [1991], esp. 8-9), or that it was inspired by a real person (or object) rather than by an imaginary or mythological one (cf. Parry [1989], esp. 180-81). Brubaker (1989), esp. 24-26, makes reference to Byzantine imagination as "the ability to transmit a resemblance, to comprehend the prototype behind the image, to see more than is present." See also Brubaker (1999), 19-23. In the Medieval mentality, a pictorial representation of an architectural structure was considered truthful as long as it included a minimum of significant features (Krautheimer [1942], 1-33). This mentality is very clearly illustrated by the many architectural and pictorial representations of the Holy Sepulchre throughout the middle ages, when the selective copying of diverse architectural features resulted in inexact and inconsistent images. Their principle objective was to concentrate on the message of the original architecture, its idea and symbolism, rather than on representational accuracy (Ousterhout [1990], 113-14; Kühnel [1987], 96-7).

⁶³⁷ Question 316 to Amphilochios *De sancto sepulcro*, *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI.1, 122-4 (esp. lines 22-60). For an English translation of the relative passage see Wilkinson (1977), 146 (where the text by Photios is mentioned as question 104 to Amphilochios). Corrigan (1992), 96 ff., also makes reference to Photios' description in relation to the image of the Tomb in the Psalter miniatures, but she notes only the conical roof and not the dimensions of the structure. She also mentions the stone door of the Tomb, a part of which, according to Photios, was bound with copper close to the Sepulchre, and she relates it to "the square stone in front of the Tomb" in the Pantokrator Psalter, folio 26v (see fig. 127).

⁶³⁸ Ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI.1, 123:49-124:58; trans. Wilkinson (1977), 146, §II.2.

the miniatures appears in two versions. In the most frequent variation, two or more parallel lines forming a fish-bone pattern run across the sides of the cone (figs 125, 127, 128, 140).⁶³⁹ The impression is quite similar to the effect created by the decorative band around the roof of the Sepulchre in a mosaic of the fifth to sixth centuries, possibly from Syria, now in Copenhagen (fig. 141).⁶⁴⁰ In the less frequent variation, lines radiating from the apex of the roof mark the sides of the cone (figs 126, 142).⁶⁴¹ The design is comparable, for example, to a relief of the late-sixth/early-seventh century, possibly from Syria, now in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection (fig. 143).⁶⁴² The central part of the relief is very similar to the miniature. Comparable is also the rendering of the Sepulchre's conical roof in some ampullae (fig. 144), and on the Narbonne model (fig. 139).⁶⁴³ Such comparisons do not, of course, intend to suggest a relationship between the miniatures and these particular works, but they do demonstrate that artists of different periods and areas resorted to similar visual solutions when representing the same monument.

Concerning the Tomb's dimensions, Photios writes that the masons hollowing out the rock cave where Christ was buried had formed a chamber high enough for a man to stand upright, and wide enough for a single person.⁶⁴⁴ In the miniatures of the marginal psalters the Sepulchre dimensions fit this description, the scale being indicated by the figure of Christ. Of course, Photios is talking about the internal dimensions of the burial chamber, while the miniaturist has represented the exterior of the Tomb, but this should not be considered a serious discrepancy. The miniaturist working in Constantinople had probably never seen the Holy Sepulchre himself, but could have had a general idea of its appearance from representations such as the ones on ampullae and descriptions like that by Photios. When painting it he might easily

⁶³⁹ Chludov Psalter, folios 26v, 78v (figs 125, 140). Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v (fig. 127), 30v (fig. 128) – and in two more miniatures where the scene depicted is not Christ rising from the Tomb, but, on folio 89r, the Jews bribing the guards of the Tomb and, on folio 112r, the Myrophores in front of the Sepulchre.

⁶⁴⁰ Biddle (1999), 26, no. 9, fig. 23, and n. 20 for further bibliography.

⁶⁴¹ Pantokrator Psalter, folio 109r (fig. 126). Also in two miniatures of the Chludov Psalter where the scene depicted is not Christ rising from the Tomb, but, on folio 6r (fig. 142), David and the soldiers outside the Sepulchre and, on folio 67v (fig. 2), the Jews bribing the guards of the Tomb. Could this decoration be related to the description of the Sepulchre's roof from the Piacenza Pilgrim (around 570), reporting that "The Tomb is roofed with a cone which is silver with added beams of gold" (Wilkinson [1977], 83)? It is probable that after the Persians severely damaged the Sepulchre in 614, it was redecorated in the same way (Wilkinson [1977], 175-176).

⁶⁴² Biddle (1999), 26, no. 10, fig. 24, n. 21a for further bibliography.

⁶⁴³ Cf. Grabar (1958), flask nos. 3, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15 from Monza (pls. IX, XI, XIV, XXII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVIII); flask nos. 3-5, 7 from Bobbio (pls. XXXIV-XXXVI, XL).

⁶⁴⁴ Ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI.1, 123:23-5; trans. Wilkinson (1977), 146, §1.3.

have translated the interior dimensions spoken of in the literary source into the dimensions of the structure as a whole. Ninth-century viewers were likely to have accepted this as an “authentic” image of the Tomb.

Why, one might ask, was the Tomb in scenes of Christ’s Resurrection in the ninth-century marginal psalters shown to resemble the Constantinian Edicule and not the rock-cut cave where Jesus was buried according to the Gospels?⁶⁴⁵ The Tomb is depicted like the actual edifice of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in various representations of the Myrophores scene on the ampullae from the Holy Land, and on reliquaries like the one now kept in the Sancta Sanctorum.⁶⁴⁶ In this case the Christological episode described in the gospels is visually linked with the experience of the pilgrims who once owned these objects as blessings and proof of their pilgrimage.⁶⁴⁷ The ninth-century psalter miniatures with an image of the Holy Sepulchre cannot, however, be justified as commemorating a pilgrimage. Their role was to emphasize the historical truth of Christ’s burial and Resurrection through direct reference to the actual site of the Tomb.⁶⁴⁸ Thus the miniatures stress the iconophile argument relating Christ’s representability to his delimitation in time and space by depicting the actual historical site of his physical circumscription in the grave.

The Tomb that contained the dead body of Christ before his Resurrection was one of the most significant holy sites that proved God’s Incarnation in Jesus, and in this way supports the iconophile view that icons are allowable and essential parts of the new dispensation.⁶⁴⁹ As already mentioned (p. 165), Grabar has argued that the iconography of Christ rising from the Tomb should be seen in the light of iconophile polemics focusing on the Incarnation. He has also pointed out that the ninth-century marginal psalters contain numerous representations of the holy sites chiefly associated

⁶⁴⁵ *Matthew* 27:60; *Mark* 15:46; *Luke* 23:53.

⁶⁴⁶ See p. 175, notes 626, 628 above.

⁶⁴⁷ Grabar (1958), 63-67, esp. 66; Wilkinson (1977), 41-42; Vikan (1982), 20; Vikan (1990), 102; Hahn (1990), 87, 91-3.

⁶⁴⁸ According to Medieval mentality, the same function of emphasizing the actuality and historicity of the biblical events was performed by all *loca sancta* and by their pictorial representations (Loerke [1984], 34, 37).

⁶⁴⁹ See n. 618 above. In Early Christian and Byzantine theology Christ’s death and burial are frequently cited to prove the reality of his Incarnation (often together with other gospel events which attest to his human nature, already mentioned in pp. 123-24, note 406 above). See, for example, Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 736 CD, PG 42, 693C, 813C; the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 405BC; *Adversus Constantinum Cabalinum*, PG 95, 317D. In the 4th hymn of Romanos Melodos on the Resurrection, Hades cries out “That is a human body that has been laid in the tomb” (ed. Maas – Trypanis [1963], 203 [§6:1]).

with the lifetime of Jesus Christ, such as Bethlehem, Golgotha and Zion (figs 100, 147-48, 189-90, 224).⁶⁵⁰ He suggested that they were emphatic assertions of Christ's human nature, and consequently used as an argument in favour of his representation in icons.⁶⁵¹ The same argument applies also to the representations of the Holy Sepulchre in scenes of Christ rising from the Tomb. Grabar did not make this observation specifically, because he was considering the construction as a general type of late-antique funerary building, not a reference to the actual site of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.⁶⁵² Corrigan, however, has elaborated his argument, since she suggested that Christ's Tomb in scenes of his Resurrection in the ninth-century marginal psalters alludes to the Holy Sepulchre in the Church of the Anastasis, although she did not examine the issue in further detail. She suggested that this reference reveals an interest in the monuments of the Holy Land, venerable sites attesting to Christ's Incarnation that were in a precarious state of preservation after the Arab conquest of the area.⁶⁵³

In the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters the depiction of Christ's Tomb in the form of the Holy Sepulchre in the Church of the Anastasis bears yet more iconophile implications. It relates to an iconophile argument concerning the status and nature of all holy sites, venerable objects and relics. To the major iconoclast accusation that icons were unsuitable for the spiritual veneration of God because of their materiality, the iconophiles responded that the holy gospel and the altar of every church, the Manger, the Cross, the Sepulchre and other holy sites and objects of Christianity were also material and man-made, yet were venerated even by the iconoclasts. To be consistent, opponent of icon-veneration should either reject them all, or accept them all.⁶⁵⁴

⁶⁵⁰ Grabar (1965), 61-82. The Church of the Nativity and the Manger appear in the Chludov Psalter, folio 131v (fig. 147); the Pantokrator Psalter, folio 184v (fig. 148); and the Paris marginal Psalter, folio 37r. On folio 140r of the Pantokrator Psalter appears a church on the hill of Golgotha. The Church of Zion appears in the Chludov Psalter, folios 51r, 79r (fig. 100), 86v (fig. 189), and on folio 121r (fig. 190) of the Pantokrator Psalter. (The church depicted in the scene of Christ's Temptation, Chludov Psalter, folio 92v, fig. 224, and Pantokrator Psalter, folio 130v, might be intended to represent Zion, but bears no relative inscription, unlike all other cases.)

⁶⁵¹ Grabar (1965), 73.

⁶⁵² Grabar (1965), 69-70.

⁶⁵³ Corrigan (1992), 94-103, esp. 97 ff.

⁶⁵⁴ See, for example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 90 (I.16), 106 (II.14), 118 (II.19); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 44 ff.; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 74 (§33:29-36), 113 (§70:11-12), 165 (§92:57-85), 169 (§92:184-90), 172-73 (§92:259-84), 235 (§142:24-25), 265 (§165:23-31), 272-73 (§17:25-34); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 344CD, *Capita VII*, PG 99, 489AB, 497A. See also Corrigan (1992), 40-42.

The Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters have several miniatures that are cases in point. On folios 4r (fig. 145) and 86r of the Chludov Psalter, David venerates a medallion of Christ hanging from the Cross, a visual reminder of the iconophile view that representations of Jesus and of the Cross are equally venerable.⁶⁵⁵ Corrigan maintains that the miniature on folio 98v of the Chludov Psalter emphasizes the material yet holy nature of the Torah sacred to the Jews and of the Cross sacred to Christians (fig. 146).⁶⁵⁶ The Manger appears on folio 131v of the Chludov Psalter and on folio 184v of the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 147-48). Moreover, on folio 30v of the Chludov Psalter a reliquary is depicted below the figures of the Just, illustrating Psalm 33:21 “...the Lord preserves all their bones” (fig. 201).⁶⁵⁷ The most frequently shown holy relic and venerable site, however, is Christ’s Tomb, which appears four times in the Chludov and six times in the Pantokrator Psalter.⁶⁵⁸ Depicted as the actual historic monument of the Holy Sepulchre, it justifies with its material yet venerable nature the representation of Jesus rising from it. At the same time, it is the figure of Christ that gives meaning to the image of the Holy Tomb, reminding us of yet another iconophile argument: Jesus is more venerable than the Manger, the Cross or the Sepulchre, all of which became holy only through contact with his body. Proportionately, the image of Christ is more venerable than their images, which in the scenes of the Nativity, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection appear only in relation to the representation of Jesus.⁶⁵⁹

The links that can be drawn between the iconophile literature and the scene of Christ’s bodily rising from the Tomb in the form of the Holy Sepulchre in the ninth-

⁶⁵⁵ For this iconophile argument, see the texts mentioned in the previous note; moreover, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 113-14 (II.16), 140 (III.36), 179 (III.86), 196 (III.131); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XIII*, 40CD, 284B, 301BC, 361DE, 377CD; Theodore the Studite, *Antirrhetici I-II*, PG 99, 352A, 376, 381AB, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 448A. See also Corrigan (1992), 72 ff.

⁶⁵⁶ Corrigan (1992), 41-42.

⁶⁵⁷ That the object represented is a reliquary is ascertained by the inscription that accompanies a similar object next to the same psalm verse in the Theodore Psalter: “σορὸς ἐνθα ἀπόκεινται τὰ λείψανα τῶν ἁγίων” (box in which rest the relics of the saints), Der Nersessian (1970), 27, fig. 65.

⁶⁵⁸ Chludov Psalter, folios 6r, 26v, 67v, 78v; Pantokrator Psalter, folios 24v, 26v, 30v, 89r, 109r, 112r. In all these cases the Tomb is painted in the form that can be identified with the actual *locus sanctus* of the Holy Sepulchre (narrow, as tall as a man, with conical roof).

⁶⁵⁹ This iconophile argument maintains that he who sanctifies is more venerable than what is being sanctified, and the same applies to their images (where what is being venerated is really the prototypes). This reasoning appears, for example, in a comparison between Christ and the Holy Cross by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 429AB, and by Theodore the Studite, *Antirrhetici I-II*, PG 99, 345B, 368B, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 448A, 449C, 461A. In the latter treatise, PG 99, 448CD, Theodore mentions not only the Cross, but also the Lance, the Nails and “all the other” objects that had to do with the life-giving Passion, to which one can certainly add the Holy Tomb of Christ.

century marginal psalters give an explanation for the appearance of this iconographic novelty in these codices. Although the iconophiles strongly condemned innovation,⁶⁶⁰ these miniatures show that they did use new forms if this served their didactic purposes. It was the theological content of the scenes that should remain faithful to the unaltered truths of the Orthodox dogma, but their external features could change so as to emphasize a specific aspect of this dogma.⁶⁶¹ This means that a rare iconographic detail can point to an elaborate message if we can find the reason for its choice. Why, for instance, is there a representation of the Tomb in the Chludov Psalter that takes a different form (type B)?

The ciborium-like form of Christ's Tomb (type B – Chludov Psalter, folio 9v)

On folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter (fig. 149) Christ's Resurrection is linked to Psalm 9:33 "Arise, O Lord God; let thy hand be lifted up, forget not the poor." The inscription above David on the left reads: "David prophesying concerning the Resurrection of the Lord."⁶⁶² Christ is depicted semi-recumbent, as if just awakened, in accordance with those Byzantine hymns and homilies that compare his death to a deep sleep.⁶⁶³ The building in front of which he is depicted stands for his Tomb;⁶⁶⁴ but it does not have the usual appearance of the conically roofed Edicule of the Holy Sepulchre we have just examined. This Tomb is a construction with four steps leading up to it, and its tall cylindrical chamber proper is topped by a ciborium, a semi-circular dome supported on columns, which is the most conspicuous architectural

⁶⁶⁰ See p. 115, n. 374 above.

⁶⁶¹ See also Brubaker (1999), 41-43.

⁶⁶² ΔΑΔ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΩΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΑΤΑΞΕΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ.

⁶⁶³ Examples in: Epiphanius of Cyprus, *In sabbato magno (dubia)*, PG 43, 440A, 464A, 465AB; Romanos Melodos, *Cantica*, ed. Maas – Trypanis (1963), 191 (On the Resurrection II, §10), 198 (On the Resurrection III, §7), 219 (On the Resurrection V, §25). In the first passage he is paraphrasing Psalm 77:65 "So the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, and as a mighty man...", which Pseudo-Athanasios interprets as prophesying the Resurrection, *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 984C – indeed illustrated with Christ rising from the Tomb in the Chludov and Pantokrator Psalters, folios 78v, 109r respectively (figs 99, 126). Germanos of Constantinople, *In vivificam crucem*, PG 98, 241, 244, 269 (quoting Genesis 49:9), 288 (quoting Psalm 77:65); *Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), II, 157:24-30 (quoting Genesis 49:9), 171:20 (Kosmas of Jerusalem, *Pro magno sabbato*, PG 98, 488), 187:6-7, 196:16. See Baltogianni (1994), 81-82, for the relation of Jesus' pose on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter with the iconography of Christ Anapeson ("the couched one"), which derives its name from Genesis 49:9 where the Fathers saw a prophecy concerning Christ's awakening from the sleep of death.

⁶⁶⁴ According to a common convention of Byzantine art, he is shown outside the Tomb but he is meant to lie inside, just awakened from the sleep of death (Kartsonis [1986], 131).

element of the structure. Corrigan mentions this depiction as a second type of Holy-Sepulchre representation, expressing her surprise that the artist was not confined only to the conically roofed version.⁶⁶⁵ She does not discuss this image further. It seems reasonable to suggest that this structure must also represent Christ's Tomb, but not in the same "realistic" mode. This "irregularity" certainly deserves further investigation.

Grabar thought the ciborium described above was intended to emphasize the sacred character of the event (Christ's Resurrection) taking place beneath it.⁶⁶⁶ An identical structure appears in the scene of Christ's Resurrection on folios 11v and 20v of the eleventh-century Theodore and Barberini Psalters respectively (fig. 151),⁶⁶⁷ illustrating Psalm 11:6 which is now missing from the Chludov Psalter.⁶⁶⁸ Originally it probably had a similar miniature, since these two eleventh-century codices are indirect copies of the ninth-century manuscript (their illustration for Psalm 9:33 is almost identical to that of the Chludov Psalter, fig. 150).⁶⁶⁹ Grabar claims that the ciborium in the Theodore Psalter (fig. 151) symbolizes the Temple of Jerusalem where Jesus is depicted teaching⁶⁷⁰, although the wording of verse 11:6, " 'Now I shall arise' says the Lord", clearly alludes to his Resurrection, as noted in certain psalm commentaries (and indeed, on folio 26v of the Pantokrator Psalter the same verse is accompanied by a miniature of Christ rising from the Tomb, fig. 127).⁶⁷¹ Perhaps the meaning of the miniatures illustrating Psalm 11:6 in the two eleventh-century codices is that Christ is teaching *about* his Resurrection – more will be said about this iconography on p. 188 below. What is of particular concern to us here is Grabar's suggestion that the ciborium-topped construction in these two miniatures alludes to the Temple of Jerusalem. In what follows I shall argue that the ciborium-like depiction of Christ's Tomb in the illustration of Psalm 9:33 in the Chludov Psalter was indeed meant as a reference to the Jewish Temple, and try to analyse some of the theological and specifically iconophile connotations pertinent to this unusual iconographic choice.

⁶⁶⁵ Corrigan (1992), 96.

⁶⁶⁶ Grabar (1979-80), 109. He does not make any other comments on the possible meaning of this peculiar iconography.

⁶⁶⁷ Der Nersessian (1970), 20, fig. 21; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 64.

⁶⁶⁸ Corrigan (1992), 143.

⁶⁶⁹ Theodore Psalter, folio 10r, Der Nersessian (1970), 20, fig. 18; Barberini Psalter, folio 18v, Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 63.

⁶⁷⁰ Grabar (1979-80), 124.

⁶⁷¹ Dufrenne (1966), 23, pl. 4. Psalm 11:6 is related to the Resurrection in the psalm commentaries of Origen, *In psalmos*, PG 12, 1061CD, and Didymos, *In psalmos*, ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), I, 166, §78 (also PG 39, 1213).

The first clue for an understanding of the building comes from the internal evidence of the Chludov Psalter itself: on folio 66r the Jewish Temple of Jerusalem from which Jesus is seen to expel the merchants and money lenders is shown as a ciborium almost identical to that on folio 9v (fig. 124). The only difference is that the columns of the Jewish Temple are taller and there are no hangings; the semi-circular shape of the dome, the decoration on top of it, and the capitals of the supporting columns are almost identical in both cases. Furthermore, the Temple is depicted as a similar ciborium in the scene of the Presentation of Christ on folio 163v (fig. 152), a very common feature in most depictions of the event in Byzantine art.⁶⁷² The ciborium also occurs in most other representations of the Jewish Temple or its Holy of Holies, such as the Virgin's Entrance to the Temple and related episodes.⁶⁷³ Usually a ciborium is shown in Byzantine art above the holy altar in scenes of the Communion of the Apostles (as in the Chludov Psalter, folio 115r, fig. 153),⁶⁷⁴ and indeed there was a ciborium over the holy altar of Christian churches, at least up to the ninth century.⁶⁷⁵ Speaking generally, the ciborium (baldachin) was used in Byzantine art to denote the holiness of a place or an object or a person depicted beneath it – such as the grave or relic of a saint, a venerable icon, or the emperor.⁶⁷⁶

A ciborium was also regularly employed in a funerary context; for example, above the bier of a dead saint (usually St Basil) in various eleventh- to fourteenth-century illustrated copies of the liturgical homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus (fig. 154).⁶⁷⁷ In one of these manuscripts, cod. Taphou 14 of the Greek Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem (folio 311v, fig. 155) one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos, is shown as a ciborium very similar to that on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter.⁶⁷⁸

⁶⁷² Xyngopoulos (1929), 338, figs 1, 3, 4, 8-10; Wessel, 'Darstellung Christi im Temple', *RbK I*, 1134-45.

⁶⁷³ Examples in Lafontaine-Dosogne (1964), I, 136-167, figs 80-81, 83-93, 97-99.

⁶⁷⁴ See Wessel, 'Ciborium', *RbK I*, 1060.

⁶⁷⁵ See Wessel, 'Ciborium', *RbK I*, 1058-1060, with further bibliography.

⁶⁷⁶ See Wessel, 'Ciborium', *RbK I*, 1055-58; Ćurčić (1991), 255. An example of this honorary use of ciboria appears on folio 50r of the Chludov Psalter where King David is shown enthroned below a ciborium.

⁶⁷⁷ Galavaris (1969), figs 11 (Moscow, State Historical Museum, cod. Vlad. 146 [Sabba 61], folio 81r, eleventh century); 114 (Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchal Library, cod. Taphou 14, folio 114r, eleventh century); 175 (Mount Athos, Panteleimon cod. 6, folio 219r, eleventh century); 282 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, cod. Canon. gr. 103, folio 90v, eleventh to twelfth century); 309 (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, cod. G 88 sup. [gr. 416], folio 15r, twelfth century); 461/466 (Paris, Bibliothèque National, cod. gr. 543, folios 130v, 260v, fourteenth century).

⁶⁷⁸ Ćurčić (1991), 255, fig. 5.

A ciborium is also shown over Christ's dead body in the iconographic theme of the *Melismos* that makes its appearance in the decoration of Byzantine churches (usually in the apse) from the twelfth century onwards (fig. 156).⁶⁷⁹ In this iconography the ciborium is shown over the holy altar on which Christ's dead body lies instead of the Eucharistic bread and wine, declaring that the Eucharist is a re-enactment of Christ's burial and Resurrection.⁶⁸⁰ This idea appears in commentaries on the Liturgy already from the fifth century,⁶⁸¹ and it is given great prominence in the relevant treatise by the iconophile Patriarch Germanos (715-730),⁶⁸² where it is stated that "The holy table corresponds to the spot in the tomb where Christ was placed" and that the ciborium "is placed in the church in order to represent concisely the crucifixion, burial and resurrection of Christ".⁶⁸³ The same identification between the holy altar of Christian churches and Christ's Tomb appears in the iconophile *Capita VII* by Theodore the Studite, where the veneration of material sacred objects and types, such as the altar, is mentioned as an argument in favour of icon veneration.⁶⁸⁴

The composition on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter recalls this connection between Christ's Tomb and the church altar by showing a ciborium over the semi-recumbent figure of Jesus in his grave. Perhaps the ciborium also has a liturgical reference here, but for the present discussion I would like to suggest only one possible iconophile connection. If the composition on folio 9v alludes indeed to the liturgical re-enactment of Christ's Passion and Resurrection during the Eucharist, and presents Christ not only inside his Tomb but also below the ciborium of the holy altar, it also declares an Orthodox dogma frequently used in iconophile polemics: that the

⁶⁷⁹ Constantinidi (1991), esp. 51-59 for the theological disputes of the twelfth century that led to the creation of this iconographic type.

⁶⁸⁰ This is only one version of the *Melismos* iconography (which in other cases depicts Christ as an infant on the altar table). See Constantinidi (1991), 128, 166-68, 185-88, 275-76. Usually Christ is naked and covered only with the *aer*, the liturgical veil used in the Eucharist to cover the holy gifts. For cases where he is depicted with the loin-cloth of his passion and the marks of the nails, or wrapped in a shroud or burial bands as if lying in his tomb see Constantinidi (1991) 137-141, 213, 231-236 (and 40-59 for the textual sources of the iconography of the *Melismos*). See also Ćurčić (1991), 256-57, figs 7-8.

⁶⁸¹ Taft (1978), 37-39; Meyendorff (1984), 28-39.

⁶⁸² Meyendorff (1984), esp. 42-54; Parson (1982), esp. 5-6, 30-65.

⁶⁸³ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. and trans. Meyendorff (1984), 58-59 (§ 4 and 5; also ed. Parson [1982], 17).

⁶⁸⁴ PG 99, 489AB.

eucharistic gifts are really Christ's body, his flesh and blood, and not just an icon of Christ, the only icon of him that the iconoclasts accepted.⁶⁸⁵

Part of the above evidence suggests that the ciborium in Byzantine art was particularly associated with the Jewish Temple and its Holy of Holies, as well as with its Christian equivalent, the holy altar of Christian churches, these being the most sacred places in the biblical and the Christian tradition of God's worship respectively.⁶⁸⁶ A depiction of the Jewish Temple of great significant for our discourse is to be found on an eleventh- to twelfth-century ivory plaque now in the Hermitage Museum (fig. 157), which shows the Crucifixion.⁶⁸⁷ To the right of the Cross, a ciborium-like structure with hangings seems to symbolize the Temple whose veil was torn at the moment of Christ's death (*Matthew* 27:51, *Mark* 15:38, *Luke* 23:45).

Given that the Jewish Temple was often represented in Byzantine art (and in two miniatures of the Chludov Psalter itself) in the form of a ciborium, this would seem to be what the illustration on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter is referring to. The Temple and the Tomb were conflated from Early Christian times onwards, as by Eusebios of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem, or in traditions concerning the site of Christ's burial reported by pilgrims.⁶⁸⁸ Such an association between the Temple and the Sepulchre goes back to Christ's own word when he compared his Resurrection to a three-day rebuilding of the Temple after its destruction (*Mark* 14:58, 15:29; *John* 2:19). Elaborating on this saying, the Church Fathers spoke about the old Jewish Temple in Jerusalem having been replaced by the spiritual Temple of the Christian faith, whose appearance in the place of the earthly Temple was brought about by Jesus' sacrifice and his Resurrection.⁶⁸⁹ These events were regularly celebrated in the

⁶⁸⁵ The same idea is inherent in the miniatures on folios 76r-v of the Chludov Psalter and folio 105r of the Pantokrator Psalter where Christ instructs the Jews that he and not the manna is the "bread of life". For the eucharistic doctrine of the iconoclasts and the iconophile response see Gero (1975a), and Corrigan (1992), 59, and 52-61, 90-91 for other miniatures of the ninth-century psalters that can be related to the issue.

⁶⁸⁶ An example of the conceptual and visual association between the Jewish Holy of Holies and the Christian altar are the miniatures of the Byzantine octateuchs (eleventh to thirteenth century) that depict the former (the tabernacle) in the form of the latter (an altar topped by a ciborium); See Brubaker (1981); Weitzmann – Bernabò (1999), 179. A similar association appears in the liturgical commentary by Patriarch Germanos where the priest in front of the holy altar is compared to Moses inside the tabernacle; *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Meyendorff (1984), 90, (§ 41); also ed. Parson (1982), 26.

⁶⁸⁷ Ivory plaque no. ω 26, Kartsonis (1986), 149, fig. 49.

⁶⁸⁸ Wilkinson (1977), 176-77.

⁶⁸⁹ Kühnel (1987), 73-89, esp. 74-77, 82-84, 88, and 107-11. See also Congar (1958), 168-180.

Eucharist, taking place in the church sanctuary, the Christian Holy of Holies that was thought to have replaced the Jewish Holy of Holies.

Visually, this connection between Christ's Tomb and the Jewish Temple has been expressed in a variety of ways. For example, the ciborium of the Holy Sepulchre on ampullae nos. 3, 5, 12, 13 from Monza and nos. 3-5, 15 from Bobbio bears, in the opinion of Kühnel, certain similarities with the depiction of the Jewish Temple and the tabernacle on the Bar-Kochba coins of 132-135 A.D., and on the western wall of the synagogue in Dura-Europos of around 250 A.D (cf figs 7, 8, 144).⁶⁹⁰ She also notes that the tripartite ciborium that stands for Christ's Tomb in a scene of the Myrophores on the sixth-century ivory pyxis 17.190.57 of the Metropolitan Museum in New York (fig. 158), is identical in construction to that on the contemporary ivory pyxis 51.114a,b of the Cleveland Museum of Art in a scene of Christ's Entrance into Jerusalem (fig. 159). The Cleveland pyxis shows the Holy Sepulchre rather than the Temple and this illustrates an idea that appears not only in patristic literature, Byzantine homilies and hymns, but also in the Jerusalemite liturgy of Palm Sunday from the fourth century onwards: that Christ's Entrance into Jerusalem marked the beginning of the events that led to his Passion and Resurrection (and so to the foundation of the new spiritual Temple of Christianity, symbolized by the Holy Sepulchre now instead of by the old Jewish Temple).⁶⁹¹

Another way of emphasising this connection between the Temple and the Sepulchre can be seen in the miniatures of folio 30v in cod. Paris. gr. 510 (fig. 132),⁶⁹² where the Temple depicted in the upper register as a component of the Crucifixion scene, is aligned with Christ's Tomb (in the form of the gospel cave) in the scenes of his Entombment and the Chairete in the next two registers. Similarly, in the frescoes of the New Tokali Kilise in Cappadocia, dated to the tenth century and related to the art of Constantinople,⁶⁹³ the Temple to the right of the Crucifixion scene in the central apse is almost exactly aligned with Christ's Tomb in the scene of the Myrophores at the Tomb represented in the register below (fig. 168).⁶⁹⁴ The latter is almost entirely destroyed, but judging by the top of a rock that can still be seen to the right of the angel, it seems likely that the Tomb was in the form of the cave of the

⁶⁹⁰ Kühnel (1987), 108-110.

⁶⁹¹ Kühnel (1987), 102-107. For the two pyxides see also *Age of Spirituality* (1979), 579-82, cat. nos. 519-20; Clair (1979).

⁶⁹² The entire folio is discussed by Brubaker (1999), 291-302.

⁶⁹³ Epstein (1986), 29-51.

⁶⁹⁴ Epstein (1986), figs 83, 87.

gospel narratives.⁶⁹⁵ However, at the left on the same lower register of the apse is the upper part of Christ's Tomb from the scene of the Entombment, and there it was represented not as a cave, but as a building.⁶⁹⁶ Its gabled roof is still visible; it appears in frontal view, decorated with a pattern formed by three triangles the one inside the other, exactly like the frontal part of the gabled roof of the Temple in the Crucifixion scene above. This creates a visual resonance between Christ's Tomb and the Jewish Temple.

From all of the above we may conclude that the ciborium-like form of Christ's Tomb on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter may have been intended to suggest a connection between the Sepulchre and the Temple. This iconographic type of the Holy Sepulchre in the shape of a small cupola standing on four columns of which only three appear is rare, and the closest parallels are the two ivory pyxides, mentioned above (figs 158-59). There is also a relevant miniature of the Myrophores at the Tomb in a thirteenth- to fourteenth-century Syrian manuscript (British Library, cod. Add. 7169, folio 12r) which is thought to have much earlier iconographic models, probably of the sixth or seventh century (fig. 160).⁶⁹⁷ Here the Tomb takes the form of a curtained ciborium (of which only two columns standing directly on the ground are supporting an arch). A ciborium with a pointed roof supported by four columns between which are hanging veils drawn aside appears in five Armenian gospels of the tenth to eleventh century, and this construction is thought to stand for the Holy Sepulchre (figs 161-62).⁶⁹⁸ A similar construction appears on folio 5v of the Georgian "Adysh" Gospels dated to 897 (Adysh, Treasury of the Church), but here the relation to the Holy Sepulchre is more obvious, since the ciborium has a conical roof, and the miniature is inscribed "Holy resurrection on Sunday" (fig. 163).⁶⁹⁹ In comparison to all these cases the Chludov Psalter is unique because it actually shows Christ below the ciborium, just awakened from the sleep of death. The question now is whether in the ninth-century codex this iconographic rarity has some specific iconophile significance.

⁶⁹⁵ Epstein (1986), 75, fig. 87.

⁶⁹⁶ Epstein (1986), fig. 84

⁶⁹⁷ Clair (1979), 128, fig. 4.

⁶⁹⁸ Underwood (1950), 89, figs 34-38 (Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate, cod. 2562, folio 3r, and cod. 2555, folio 7r; the Etchmiazin Gospels, Etchmiazin Treasury, cod. 229, folio 5v; Vienna, Mekhitharist Library, cod. 697, folio 6r; loose page in the State Repository of Manuscripts at Erevan).

⁶⁹⁹ Underwood (1950), 93, fig. 44.

Christ's saying on the restoration of the Temple in three days after its destruction is an obvious reference to his Resurrection three days after his death. A detail of particular importance for our discourse is found in *John* 2:19-23. In line 21 it is specified that "the temple he had spoken of was his body." Early Christian and Byzantine homilies and hymns as well as ecumenical council Acts and other dogmatic treatises further elaborate this concept: the Temple is the house of God. By analogy, Christ's body inhabited by the divinity is the holy temple in which dwells the divine Logos. In the course of Christ's Passion his body suffered death, the temple of his flesh was destroyed, but his divine nature brought back to life his human nature; in other words, it restored the temple where the divinity dwelled (indeed, according to a commonplace expression "Christ raised the temple of his body."). In consequence, the image of the temple symbolizes not only Christ's Resurrection, but also the unity of his two natures is one hypostasis.⁷⁰⁰ In fact, Early Christian and Byzantine theology employed the symbol of the temple to refer to Christ's body and the unity of his two natures in one hypostasis, whether in relation to his Resurrection or not.⁷⁰¹ Similar expressions are also found in the iconophile literature.⁷⁰²

The insistence of iconophile polemics on the Orthodox dogma of Christ's human and divine natures in hypostatic union and its declaration through the Saviour's iconic representation, as already mentioned, may be linked with folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter showing Jesus' Tomb surmounted by a ciborium. This feature may be taken to refer to the Temple of Jerusalem, as well as to Christ's body as the temple of his divinity. In the light of all the above, the illustration of Psalm 11:6 in the

⁷⁰⁰ Examples of relevant references in the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 764B, 869D, 876B, 893B, *Mansi* V, 48CD, 93CD, 117B, 384A; Amphilochios of Iconium, *Sententiae et excerpta*, PG 39, 105; John Chrysostom, PG 59 (*spuria*), 584 (*In Matthaeum* 20:1), 686 (*In Thomam*); Proclus of Constantinople, *New Homilies*, ed. Leroy (1967), 217 (Homily 30, §1:1), 247 (Homily 33, §12:46); Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 813A (Psalm 15:8), 896C (Psalm 34:4), 1000A (Psalm 40:11), *Festive Letters*, SC 372, 184 (I.6:169-70), 284 (V.1:40), 396 (VI.12:74-75); Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 156 (X.1,2:165-70), 177 (X.2.6:43-44); *Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1891-98), II, 129:9, 169:20-25, 172:8-9.

⁷⁰¹ For references related to the Resurrection see the previous note. For other examples: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 580B, 640E, 641E, 677B, 876D, 897A, *Mansi* V, 113C, 293E, 300AB/E, 356D; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VII, 469C, 828B; Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 568A, 597DE, 628AB; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 42, 657A; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 183 (X.2,7:84); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), III, 49 (epistle 284:1599-1603), *Biblioteca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), V, 15:3-10. See also Lampe (1961), 898, "ναός", H.2; Congar (1958), 158-180. See also n. 706 below, for references to the Theotokos in whose body Christ's temple was constructed.

⁷⁰² Examples by Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 104-105 (§63:3-25), 228 (§134:6-16); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 448 (epistle 305:21-23), 743 (502:13-15/20-23), 797 (532:54-56).

Theodore and the Barberini Psalters (p. 182, fig. 151) appears more meaningful. The ciborium behind the seated Christ may refer to the Temple of Jerusalem, the Holy Sepulchre that took its place in Christian belief, and the true temple of God, Christ's body. Christ is shown teaching in the Temple-Sepulchre about his Resurrection by means of which he would restore the true temple, his body housing the godhead. (Indeed, according to *John* 2:19-22 Christ was in the Temple when he spoke symbolically about its destruction and three-day restoration). The inclusion of David in the illustration of both psalms (9:33 and 11:6) seems all the more fitting in view of the patristic literature referring to the temple (the body of Christ) as originating from the psalmist's seed, since the lineage of Jesus went back to the house of David.⁷⁰³ So in these scene of Christ's Resurrection, where the emphasis is on his human nature as the temple housing his divinity, the figure of the psalmist may be taken to represent not only the prophet of the Resurrection, but also the forefather of Jesus, and as such stresses yet again the reality of the Incarnation, the principal iconophile justification for the representability of Jesus Christ. Indeed, Kartsonis has proposed that the figures of David and Solomon as a standard element of the Anastasis iconography from the tenth century onwards in Byzantine art emphasizes exactly this idea.⁷⁰⁴

Two later manuscripts are relevant here, the two twelfth-century Constantinopolitan codices containing the homilies on the Virgin written by Jacob of the Kokkinovaphos Monastery (cod. Paris. gr. 1208, and cod Vat. gr. 1162). On folios 173v and 127v of the two manuscripts respectively, we find an iconographic form very similar to that of the miniature on folio 9v in the Chludov Psalter (fig. 164).⁷⁰⁵ Both miniatures illustrate the Virgin's dialogue with the archangel Gabriel at the moment that she submits to becoming the vehicle for the Incarnation of the Logos. According to Early Christian and Byzantine theology, when the Virgin accepted the divine Logos into her womb, she herself became the temple of God and with her flesh built the temple of the divinity, Christ's body.⁷⁰⁶ In accordance with this notion, the

⁷⁰³ Examples by Diodoros of Tarsos, *Fragmenta contra Synousiastas*, PG 33, 1560B; Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1392B (Psalm 67:24), 1576A (Psalm 88:10), 1905A (Psalm 131:6), 1909C (Psalm 132:17); Basil of Seleukia, *Contra Iudaeos (spuria)*, PG 85, 405C.

⁷⁰⁴ Kartsonis (1986), 186-200.

⁷⁰⁵ Omont (1927); Stornajolo (1910).

⁷⁰⁶ Examples of references to the Virgin as God's temple: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 580E, 1253A/C, 1256B; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *In laudes S. Mariae deiparae, (dubia)*, PG 43, 488CD, 492B/D, 496D; Andrew of Crete, *In nativitatem B. Mariae IV*, PG 97, 868C, *Canon in B. Annae conceptionem*, PG 97, 1316AB. See also Eustratiadis (1930), 47-48, "ναός". References to Christ building his temple, i.e. his body, from his mother's flesh in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical

artist executing the two miniatures covered the small building behind the Virgin with a ciborium similar to that on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter, painted directly above the figure of Mary as the vessel by means of which the temple of Christ's divinity, his body, was formed. In the four preceding miniatures where the Virgin is also speaking with the archangel, the architectural background is exactly the same, with the one difference that the building has a cupola instead of a ciborium, signifying that Mary has not yet accepted to become the temple of the Logos (fig. 165).⁷⁰⁷ On only two other occasions has the artist used the same iconographic element with a similar symbolism. First, in the miniature of the Virgin's Nativity, a ciborium is painted directly above the figure of the infant, born to become the temple of God (fig. 166).⁷⁰⁸ Secondly, in the scene where Anna places the child in her own room, there is a ciborium above Mary's bed, recalling the statement found in the *Protevangelion* of Jacob "Anna established a sanctuary in the chambers of the infant" (fig. 167).⁷⁰⁹ In all the other miniatures of the two manuscripts the ciborium appears only in connection to the Holy Temple in Jerusalem, which was regularly denoted in Byzantine art by a ciborium.⁷¹⁰ Although the two Kokkinovaphos manuscripts were executed almost three centuries after the Chludov Psalter, they seem to visualize in very similar terms commonplace literary expressions regarding the temple as a symbol of Christ's Incarnation.

Council, *Mansi* IV, 613A, 624D, 633D, 656A, *Mansi* V, 24C, 40C, 292BC, 305B; Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VI, 669B, 736B; Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 584E; Cyril of Alexandria, *Festive Letters*, SC 372, 324 (Letter V.7:90-91), SC 392, 106 (VIII.6:69-76); Andrew of Crete, *In nativitate B. Mariae II/IV*, PG 97, 883A, 868B; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), III, 35 (epistle 284:1303-1308) *Biblioteca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), IV, 151:27-28, 161:15-16, 164:34-36.

⁷⁰⁷ Cod. Paris. gr. 1208, folios 160v, 165v, 168v, 171v (Omont [1927]); cod. Vat. gr. 1162, folios 118r, 122r, 124r, 126r (Stornajolo [1910]). The symbolic use of the ciborium in the two miniatures of the manuscripts in question is also noted by Fournée (1968), 229-230, who sees in it a reference to the Theotokos being God's sanctuary and holy altar, in accordance with similar expressions used in the liturgy of the Annunciation, and in the hymn Akathistos (oikos 23). The altar ("ἡ ἁγία τράπεζα" above which a ciborium is usually shown in Byzantine art) is another common denomination of the Virgin in the Byzantine literary tradition, related to her role as temple of the divinity. See Eustratiadis (1930), 79, "τράπεζα".

⁷⁰⁸ Cod. Paris. gr. 1208, folio 38v (Omont [1927]); cod. Vat. gr. 1162, folio 29r (Stornajolo [1910]).

⁷⁰⁹ Cod. Paris. gr. 1208, 63v (Omont [1927]); cod. Vat. gr. 1162, folio 46v (Stornajolo [1910]). Fournée (1968), 230, mentions this passage from the *Protevangelion*, but he relates it by mistake to the miniature of Mary's Nativity, and he does not mention at all the scene where Anna places the infant in her own room.

⁷¹⁰ Noted also by Fournée (1968), 230. For example, in cod. Vat. gr. 1162 the ciborium signifies the Jewish Temple or its Holy of Holies on folios 65r, 67v, 68v, 74v, 76v, 90r, 92r, 93v, 97v, 100r, 104r, 142r, and 190r.

The Temple veil

Returning to the miniature on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter, there is another detail of possible significance: the hangings drawn aside in the ciborium may perhaps be read as symbolizing Christ's two natures when they are related to the gospel mention of the veil of the Temple being torn at the moment Jesus died on the Cross (*Matthew* 27:51, *Mark* 15:38, *Luke* 23:45). Although this interpretation may at first seem far-fetched, I believe careful analysis will support it.

Christ himself spoke of the destruction of the Temple in reference to the Passion. In Christian exegesis the veil is considered a symbol of Christ's flesh, rent asunder at the time of his death and restored by his Resurrection. It was by means of this *καταπέτασμα* (literally "curtain"), this vehicle of the Incarnation, the veil of Christ's flesh, that God became known to the world.⁷¹¹ In Early Christian and Byzantine literature the tearing of the Temple veil is interpreted as the revelation of the truth of the salvation for all humanity, as opposed to its concealment in the Jewish Temple where the tabernacle remained hidden behind the veil, and only the high priest could see it once a year. In other words, the torn veil symbolized the revelation of God to all people through Christ's Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection. This concept was first formulated by St Paul (*Hebrews* 6:19-20, 10:19-20,) and repeated and further elaborated, among others by John Chrysostom, Kosmas Indikopleustes, John of Damascus, and Patriarch Photios.⁷¹² Moreover, in his homily *On holy Saturday* Patriarch Photios compares directly the tabernacle of the Law, where the sacred objects of the Jews were kept, with Christ's Tomb, the life-giving tabernacle of the new dispensation where no types and shadows but the truth itself, the mystery of the Incarnation of the Logos, was revealed to the entire ecumene.⁷¹³ Although Photios

⁷¹¹ For example, John Chrysostom, *In memoriam martyrum (spuria)*, PG 52, 829-30; Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 89, 1193AB (Psalm 44:9-10); Basil of Seleukia, *In annuntiationem*, PG 85, 433B. See also Lampe (1961), 714, "καταπέτασμα", 3.e; Papastavrou (1993)141-143.

⁷¹² John Chrysostom, *In epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG 63, 27, 119, *In memoriam martyrum, (spuria)*, PG 52, 829-31; Kosmas Indikopleustes, *Christian Topography*, ed. Wolska-Conus (1968-73), II, 47; John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 226 (96, IV.23:61-64); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 163-64 (epistle 125:21-48), *Fragmenta in Lucam*, PG 101, 1226. Kessler (1993), 63-65, mentions some of the above texts. See also Eberlein (1983), 68. For an analysis of *Hebrews* 6:19-20, 10:19-20 in relation to the symbolism of the veil see Hofius (1972).

⁷¹³ *Homilies*, ed. Laourdas (1959), 119:5-14 (§7, trans. Mango [1958], 209).

does not mention the torn veil of the Temple, he makes an implicit allusion to it through his reference to the revelation of the divine mystery in Christ's Tomb as the new Holy of Holies. In patristic texts the rending of the Temple veil at the time of the Crucifixion was also considered symbol of Christ's hypostatically united two natures, being a sign that the man who died on the Cross was also Son of God.⁷¹⁴

In the same exegetical tradition belongs a passage from the *Ecclesiastical History* by Patriarch Germanos, which was the most popular liturgical commentary in the Middle Byzantine period.⁷¹⁵ Germanos identifies the *aer*, the cloth covering the holy gifts on the altar, with the stone that sealed Christ's grave. He calls it *καταπέτασμα* and he relates it with the Temple veil by quoting *Hebrews* 10:19:21 where the revelation of the Holy of Holies to all Christians is said to have been performed through the veil of Christ's flesh. The lifting of the *καταπέτασμα* three times above the sanctified gifts and its final removal before Communion are interpreted as a re-enactment of Christ's three-day burial and Resurrection. In this way God's mysteries are seen no more through the cloud that covered Moses' eyes in the tabernacle, but are manifested directly through the Incarnation of the Logos.⁷¹⁶ In other words, the lifted veil becomes a symbol of the Resurrection, and God's revelation to humanity through Christ.

In the light of the rich exegetical tradition outlined above, folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter may be read as showing the hangings tied back to the columns in allusion to God having been revealed through Christ's Incarnation and especially his Resurrection, with his human nature acting as the instrument of divine manifestation. The following evidence further corroborates this interpretation.

The motif of the curtains drawn aside is frequently used in medieval art, both in Byzantium and the West, to symbolize the revelation of God through the Incarnation of the Logos in Christ, and open curtains or a spread veil are often employed as symbolic of the Incarnation in various scenes related to the

⁷¹⁴ Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* V, 300E, 1248BC; John Chrysostom, *In crucem*, (*spuria*), PG 50, 823-24, *In ascensionem III*, (*spuria*), PG 52, 797, *In pascha VI*, (*spuria*), PG 59, 744; Proclus of Constantinople, PG 65, 785B (*In dominicam passionem*), 788C (*In resurrectionem*), 793BC (*In S. pascha*); *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Papadakis (1970), 89 (§48:987); Patriarch Photios, *Homilies*, ed. Laourdas (1959), 124:31-125:10 (XII,5-6), trans. Mango (1958), 215-16; *Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1894), 129:3-6, 134:17-20, 141:24, 143:10-13, 148:1-4, 155:8, 160:24. (Many of the above passages mention also the creation's supernatural reaction to the Crucifixion as sign of Christ's divinity –see pp. 131-32, n. 447above).

⁷¹⁵ Parson (1982), 5-6; Meyendorff (1984), 52-54.

⁷¹⁶ Ed. and trans. Meyendorff (1984), 80-90 (§41); also ed. Parson (1982), 25-26.

Annunciation, the Conception and the Nativity, and in representations of the Virgin and Child, or of the Evangelists who announced the Incarnation of the Saviour to the world.⁷¹⁷ The device of open curtains pointed to the sacred status of the person shown between them.⁷¹⁸ Sudden revelations from behind veils were part of state and Church ceremonial, in imperial audiences, in the liturgy, and in the case of miraculous images.⁷¹⁹ One of the most famous examples of this kind is the weekly miracle that was reported to take place in the Church of the Blachernitissa in Constantinople, where the *maphorion* of the Virgin was kept. Every Friday the veil hanging in front of a venerable icon of the Mother of God miraculously lifted itself to reveal the sacred image.⁷²⁰ Intrinsic to this miracle seems to be the idea of the Temple veil being lifted to reveal the truth of the Incarnation. (Note that the miracle occurred on Fridays, the same day of Christ's Passion, when the Temple veil had been torn asunder, revealing that Christ was really the Incarnated Logos). The same Christological symbolism of the Temple veil is attached to the veil covering the Virgin's head in the iconographic type of the Kykkotissa, popular in Byzantium from the twelfth century onwards (fig. 17).⁷²¹

The above examples indicate that the veil of the Temple as symbol of the Incarnation was employed in several different ways in Byzantine art and culture, attesting to (and further enhancing) the familiarity of the public with its theological significance. The curtains drawn aside in the miniature on folio 9v of the Chludov

⁷¹⁷ See, for example, Eberlein (1983). On p. 70 a Byzantine origin is proposed for the motif of the drawn curtains as symbolic reference to the Incarnation in relation to the figure of the Virgin and Child, using as evidence a Coptic relief of unknown date (but before the 10th c.) in Cairo and a miniature of the Etchmiazin Gospelbook of 989 (Erevan, Matenadaran, cod. 2374, folio 7v). See also Papastavrou (1993). She claims that the veil appearing as symbol of the Incarnation in some Late-Byzantine scenes of the Conception derives from Western art, but the extensive use of this symbol in relation to the Incarnation of Christ in Byzantine literature and art from a much earlier date suggests that the hypothesis of occidental prototypes is questionable.

⁷¹⁸ For an extensive analysis of the subject see Eberlein (1982); also Siegel (1977), where the iconography of the veil from Antiquity until the Renaissance is examined. See also Grabar (1945), 125-28.

⁷¹⁹ Mathews (1971), 162-171, and Taft (1978), 209-210, 244-249, for the use of veils to conceal the holy gifts or the altar in the liturgy (cf. the reference by Patriarch Germanos in his *Ecclesiastical History*, mentioned above p. 192). For the use of curtains in imperial ceremonial Mathews (1971), 164. See also Grabar (1945), 126-28.

⁷²⁰ Lidov (2000), 56, with further bibliography.

⁷²¹ The Christ Child in Mary's arms holds tightly the veil covering her head. This has been considered a symbol of the Incarnation related to the Temple veil, type of the "veil of the flesh" that Christ took from his mother. See Papastavrou (1993), 156 and n. 132 for relative bibliography on the subject; also Carr (2000) and Carr forthcoming. In some icons of the Kykkotissa (e.g. a thirteenth-century icon now in the Byzantine Museum of the Holy Bishopric of Paphos, *Mother of God* [2000], 350-51, cat. no. 36) the veil is decorated with the diapered pattern that at times appears in depictions of the Temple veil itself (examples of the latter iconographic element by Kessler [1993], 64, n. 26, figs 4, 5).

Psalter may be taken to belong to the same visual vocabulary. By emphasising the idea that through Christ's flesh the godhead was revealed to the world, they underline the iconophile argument that the Saviour could and should be represented in images as a result and proof of the Incarnation of the Logos. This interpretation is in perfect agreement with a passage from the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council which states that "The name 'Christ' implies two natures, the one being visible and the other invisible. Thus this Christ, while visible to men by means of the veil (*καταπέτασμα*), that is his flesh, made the divine nature – even though this remained concealed – manifest through signs."⁷²² On folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter the veil is opened to reveal Christ arisen with his visible human nature and the energy of his invisible divinity, gloriously manifested in his greatest "sign" of all, the miracle of the Resurrection.⁷²³

That in this miniature the veil is a carefully chosen and meaningful iconographic element is further sustained by the fact that it is not shown in the other two depictions of the Temple in the Chludov Psalter, the expulsion of the merchants and Christ's Presentation to the Temple (figs 124, 152), where the same ciborium is used to signify the architectural setting. In those cases it is the Temple in general and not the Holy of Holies that is being shown, and the scene does not involve a theophanic revelation as in the case of the Resurrection, so the omission of the lifted veil is logical. In the illustration of Psalm 11:6 in the Theodore and Barberini Psalters (that probably copy a similar miniature now missing from the Chludov Psalter) the veil is also omitted for good reason (fig. 151). Since it is not the Resurrection itself that is being shown but Christ teaching about it, the miraculous theophany has not taken place yet, so the symbol of the divine revelation through the veil of the flesh is not appropriate for inclusion in the scene. Since the illustration of Psalm 9:33 in the two eleventh-century psalters is a faithful copy of the miniature on folio 9v in the Chludov Psalter (including the veil, fig. 150), it seems probable that the omission of the veil from the illustration of Psalm 11:6 is not coincidental, but also reflects faithfully the ninth-century prototype.

Turning to other representations that certainly depict the Temple veil, we see that in the Crucifixion scene on the Hermitage ivory the *καταπέτασμα* is still spread across the columns of the ciborium that symbolizes the Jewish Temple (fig. 157).

⁷²² *Mansi* XIII, 340D; trans. Sahas (1986), 156-57.

⁷²³ See also Sahas (1986), 157, n. 34.

Being a prominent feature in the composition, it reminds the viewer of the relevant gospel event, although it is not shown torn asunder. On the contrary, in the tenth-century fresco of the Crucifixion in Tokali Kilise, the veil is almost completely torn in the middle (fig. 168);⁷²⁴ and on folio 80r of the thirteenth-century Armenian cod. Matenadaran 7651 in Erevan it is completely torn and appears as two separate curtains blown apart from each other by a strong wind (fig. 169), symbolizing the moment of Christ's death when the veil of his flesh is violently torn.⁷²⁵ After the Passion, at the time of his Resurrection, the torn veil is left solemnly open to reveal the Incarnated Logos, the true Holy of Holies, to all humanity, as on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter. In this miniature the hangings are symmetrically drawn to the sides, giving prominence to a central column.

Now the ciborium is obviously assumed to rest on four columns, only three of which appear, the fourth standing right behind the central one. However, the choice to represent the ciborium from such an angle that only three columns appear in perfect symmetry, those at the sides holding back the veil to reveal the middle one, is not repeated in any other miniature of the Chludov Psalter where a ciborium construction is depicted (figs 124, 147, 152, 153).⁷²⁶ Is this exceptional arrangement of the three columns in the miniature of folio 9v itself significant? Could the three columns in some way refer to the Trinity, and the central column to Christ, the incarnated person of the Trinity who was unveiled to the eyes of man? It may be objected that this is surely over-interpretation. The issue is a methodological one therefore, with many implications for the study of the ninth-century marginal psalters, and will have to be assessed through an understanding of Byzantine mentality, of how this art was viewed by its contemporary audience. Any answer must depend on a knowledge of theological exegesis, and on how far it was applied to the visual creations of Byzantine society. We need to assess both the planning and viewing of Byzantine iconography in general, and in the ninth century in particular.

⁷²⁴ Epstein (1986), figs 83, 86-87.

⁷²⁵ Der Nersessian (1993), II, fig. 471.

⁷²⁶ On folio 66r the middle of the three columns supporting the ciborium in the Expulsion of the merchants from the Temple is not exactly centred, and the curtains are missing (fig. 124). On folio 163v all four columns of the ciborium appear in the scene of Christ's Presentation to the Temple (fig. 152). This is also the case on folio 131v, where a ciborium is depicted over the Holy Manger in the church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (fig. 147). On folio 115r only two columns of the ciborium in the Communion of the Apostles are visible, the others being concealed by the figure of Christ standing in the middle (fig. 153; see also p. 203 below). Only two lateral columns are depicted supporting the ciborium above the enthroned figure on folio 29v, and the enthroned David on folio 50r.

Christ the column

In this section we shall consider the use of the column as a symbol for Christ in the Christian literature and the art of the Late Antique and Medieval period, both in Byzantium and in the West. The first textual references are biblical. In *Genesis* 28:18-19, Jacob, after his dream of the ladder (a Christological or Mariological symbol related to the Incarnation, according to exegetical tradition),⁷²⁷ “rose up in the morning, and took the stone he had laid there by his head, and he set it up as a pillar (στήλην), and poured oil on the top of it. And he called the name of that place, the House of God.” According to Gregory Nazianzenus and Patriarch Photios, this pillar symbolized Christ.⁷²⁸ Furthermore, “the pillar (στῦλος) and foundation of the truth” mentioned in *I. Timothy* 3:15 in connection with “the church of the living God” is also considered a symbol of Christ by Origen and Epiphanius of Cyprus.⁷²⁹

As regards the visual use of this symbolism in art, there is an instance of it on a glass cup in the collection of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, and on a glass bowl belonging to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, both of the fourth century (figs 170-71). On them two apostles are shown flanking a column surmounted by the Christogram, probably a combination intended to symbolize Christ.⁷³⁰ In the medieval art of the West the column appears as a symbol of Christ both in architecture and sculpture, while in painting it is used especially in scenes of the Annunciation, symbolizing both the Incarnation of Christ and the virginity of Mary.⁷³¹ In Byzantine art, from the fourteenth century onwards, a column or pillar topped by a vase with flowers appears in scenes of the Annunciation or of Christ’s

⁷²⁷ Brubaker (1999), 208-209.

⁷²⁸ Gregory Nazianzenus, Homily 28, *SC* 250, 136:12-13 (he uses the biblical term for Jacob’s pillar, “στήλην”); Photios, *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI.1, 18 (question 236; he uses the word “λίθος”, stone, for Jacob’s pillar). See also Brubaker (1999), 209.

⁷²⁹ Origen, *In Joannem*, *PG* 14, 740B; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, *PG* 42, 256D. See Lampe (1961), 1265, “στῦλος”, 2. For similar interpretations of the symbol of the column in the West see the examples cited by Papastavrou (1989), 146-148.

⁷³⁰ See Papastavrou (1989), 148, fig. 4. The object in the Biblioteca Vaticana (no. 176), and the one in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (no. 16.174.3), are published by Morey (1959), 18-19, 74, pls. XII, XXXVI, nos. 76 and 455 respectively. For the bowl of the Metropolitan Museum see also *Age of Spirituality* 1979, 570-571, cat. no. 508.

⁷³¹ Papastavrou (1989), 148-154, with reference to various examples and relative bibliography.

Presentation in the Temple on portable icons and sanctuary doors.⁷³² The motif can be related to biblical prefigurations of the Virgin, such as the flowering rod of Aaron, and with relevant expressions in Byzantine hymns and homilies referring to her role in the Incarnation.⁷³³ By extension, the column or pillar motif is also related to Christ, and acts as a symbol of the Incarnation. A most significant case is the miniature on folio 28v of the thirteenth-century New Testament cod. Christ Church gr. 12 (fig. 172), where next to the full-length portrait of the evangelist Matthew stands a column supporting a basin containing a bust-sized representation of Christ-Emmanuel (probably reference to Christ as the fountain of life), creating a strong image of Christ as the pillar of truth.⁷³⁴

More significant for the analysis of folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter is the sixth-century mosaic in the Monastery of St Catherine at Mount Sinai (figs 173-75).⁷³⁵ It has the Transfiguration in the conch, surrounded by a band of medallions, with portraits of the prophets at the bottom, and of the Apostles around the top. The mosaics of the triumphal arch are divided into two registers (fig. 174). In the lower, medallions of the Virgin and St John the Baptist appear right and left, below two angels who are flanking a central medallion with the Lamb of God. In the upper register Moses is depicted in two separate scenes left and right of two central windows— in front of the burning bush and receiving the tablets of the Law respectively. The whole composition of the apse and the triumphal arch consists of a series of theophanies, God's revelations to mankind: first indirectly through the Old Testament episodes that prefigure the Incarnation; and finally directly through the focal scene of the Transfiguration, when the Incarnated Logos appeared to his disciples shining with supernatural light, manifesting his divinity through his human nature.⁷³⁶

⁷³² Papastavrou (1989), 145, 154 ff., where characteristic examples are mentioned and the symbolism of the iconography is examined in relation to textual sources, especially in connection to the Virgin. However, the hypothesis of the author (pp. 154, 159-160) that this iconographic element was adopted in Byzantine art under the influence of Western art is rather dubious, since relative textual expressions abounded in Byzantine religious texts (cf. Eustratiadis [1930], 74-75, “στήλη”, “στυλος”, concerning the Virgin) and the use of the column as symbol of Christ was also known in Byzantium, as the following examples will demonstrate.

⁷³³ Papastavrou (1989), 154-60.

⁷³⁴ Hutter (1993), 88-89, with further bibliography.

⁷³⁵ Forsyth – Weitzmann (1973), 11-20, plates CIII-CXXIX, CXXXVI-CLXXXVII; Weitzmann (1982), 5-19.

⁷³⁶ Elsner (1995), 99-124.

One detail in this mosaic is of special importance for us. This is the column represented between the two windows of the triumphal arch (figs 173-74, 176). Its representation in mosaic emphasizes its pictorial role as part of the meaning of the entire ensemble. It prominently forms the top of the axis along which are depicted the Lamb of God in a medallion directly below it, another medallion with the cross at the apex of the apse, the figure of Christ in the Transfiguration scene, and the medallion with the bust of David in the centre of the band with roundels of the prophets along the lower edge of the mosaic (figs 173-74). Such an alignment strongly supports the idea that the column at the top is a symbol of Christ. This impression is reinforced by the repetition of the cross four times along the same axis: on the column's capital (fig. 176, behind the Lamb in the medallion below the column (fig. 177), in the cross-medallion at the top of the apse and in the cross inscribed inside Christ's halo in the Transfiguration scene (fig. 173). Furthermore, the medallion with the cross shown on the column's capital and the gems decorating the column shaft recall analogous elements (Christogram and inset gems) on the column represented in the glass bowl of the Metropolitan Museum of Art mentioned above, thought to be a symbol of Christ (fig. 171).

The column in the Sinai mosaic certainly enhances the Christological symbolism of the decoration. When the sun comes into the church through the two windows on the triumphal arch (figs 173, 175), the column appears invested with light, similar to Christ who is shown below it in a mandorla exuding rays of light, and shining in his white and golden robes in the scene of the Transfiguration. In this setting the column may be seen as emblematic of the Incarnated Logos, glowing in the theophanic light of his Transfiguration. In addition, the two windows and the column in the middle might be a Trinitarian symbol: the two windows, sources of light, alluding to the two immaterial and invisible persons of the Trinity, (God the Father and the Holy Ghost), and the column in the centre pointing with its materiality to Christ as the incarnated and visible middle person of the Trinity.

This symbolic theophany is flanked by the two panels showing Old Testament theophanic events – of Moses standing in front of the burning bush, and receiving the tablets of the Law (fig. 174). In both images the segment of sky with God's hand towards which Moses is turned is shown to the left and right of the two windows, giving the impression that the natural light coming into the church plays an active role in the Old Testament scenes. The column invested with the light of the two windows

seems, therefore, a symbol of the Trinity as the source of Moses' theophanic experiences, as well as of the Transfiguration.⁷³⁷ In the New Testament theophany in the apse, Christ is shown in his human form as the incarnated Logos. In the register of the Old Testament episodes that preceded the Incarnation he is shown in a symbolic form, the column, a Christological type that according to the Church Fathers had already made its appearance in an earlier Old Testament event (the anointment of Jacob's pillar, *Genesis* 28:18-19,).

This interpretation complements Weitzmann's suggestion that the three concentric circles of different shades of blue forming the two medallions which include the Lamb of God and the cross have a Trinitarian symbolism, while the central image in each medallion (the Lamb of God and the cross) symbolize Christ's humanity (figs 173, 177).⁷³⁸ Weitzmann notes that these two medallions carry the same theological message as the scene of the Transfiguration in the apse: they emphasize the dogma of Christ's two natures, human and divine, with specific reference to the Trinity.⁷³⁹ The column flanked by the two windows at the top of the entire ensemble perfectly fits this reading. The tripartite disposition here has a certain analogy to the three columns supporting the ciborium on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter, where the lateral columns are partly concealed by the veil wrapped around them in order to fully reveal the central column, a possible symbol of Christ.

Closer in date to the Chludov Psalter is a miniature from cod. Paris. gr. 510. On folio 174v (fig. 178), three Old Testament episodes introduce Gregory's homily "On Theology": the sacrifice of Isaac in the top register, Jacob's struggle with the angel and his dream of the ladder in the middle, and the anointing of David in the lower register.⁷⁴⁰ Only the episodes concerning Isaac and Jacob, both types of Jesus, are mentioned in the homily. Brubaker argues that, although David's unction is not referred to in the text, it must have been included as another typological prefiguration of Christ (as he with the chrism, the anointed one).⁷⁴¹ The feature of particular interest to us in this miniature is the column that forms part of the building depicted at the far right of the bottom register. In her extensive study of Paris. gr. 510 Brubaker notes

⁷³⁷ See Elsner (1995), 114-17, for some comments on the importance of light in the visual language of the Sinai mosaic in relation to patristic tradition on mystic contemplation and exegesis of the Transfiguration.

⁷³⁸ Weitzmann (1982), 14.

⁷³⁹ Weitzmann (1982), 14-15; see also Forsyth – Weitzmann (1973), 14-15.

⁷⁴⁰ Omont (1929), 23, pl. XXXVII; Brubaker (1999), 186-93, 207-210, fig. 23.

⁷⁴¹ Brubaker (1999), 187.

the emphasis the miniaturist has given to this column, which sits on a plinth and appears separate from the rest of the building although it seems to support the cornice. As she observes, this emphasis does not recur in any of the many other architectural settings shown in this codex. Never again is a single column set in such a prominent position within a building.⁷⁴² This column could be as significant as the pillar represented exactly above it in the middle register, which stands for the rock Jacob had anointed after his dream of the ladder.

Brubaker notes that in no other Byzantine representation of the dream is this pillar included, and that its appearance in the miniature under examination reflects the fact that both Gregory and Photios considered it a type of Christ.⁷⁴³ She also observes that in the miniature the pillar ties the Jacob image not only to the sacrifice of Isaac above it, where an altar very similar in form is again depicted at the far right of the register, but also to the anointing of David which appears below. She is not referring to the column being aligned with both the altar and the pillar, but points out that the anointed stone and the anointed David are both types of Christ.⁷⁴⁴ She also notes the identical clothing worn by Isaac, Jacob and David as a device to further emphasize the interrelation of the three figures as prefigurations of Christ.⁷⁴⁵ The significance of the column aligned with Abraham's altar and especially Jacob's anointed pillar may be similar: one more element symbolizing Christ, the Incarnated Logos, according to the textual and visual tradition mentioned above.

The fact that in this scene of David's anointment the column is not free-standing as in the Sinai mosaic and the fourth-century glass representations may have additional symbolic significance. Since it is the only column seen to support the building and is shown to stand at the corner of the edifice on a large and prominent cornerstone plinth, it may symbolize Christ as founder and foundation of the Church, following a number of biblical references and especially two well-known passages from Paul's epistles. In *Ephesians* 2:19-21, he wrote "...you are...fellow citizens with God's people and members of God's household, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone (*ἀκρογωνιαίον* [*λίθον*])). In him the whole building is joined together and rises to

⁷⁴² Brubaker (1999), 187.

⁷⁴³ Brubaker (1999), 209.

⁷⁴⁴ Brubaker (1999), 209.

⁷⁴⁵ Brubaker (1999), 209-210.

become a holy temple in the Lord.” And in *I.Timothy* 3:15: “...you will know how people ought to conduct themselves in God’s household, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth.”⁷⁴⁶ As already mentioned, the latter excerpt was used in patristic exegesis for identifying the column as symbolic of Christ, the foundation of the Church. This interpretation of the column in the miniature under examination also fits the biblical reference to the pillar anointed by Jacob, which is represented directly above it. According to *Genesis* 28:18, after Jacob had anointed the pillar, “...he called the name of that place, the House of God”, which can be understood as the Church founded by Christ. It is worth noting that Photios himself, in question 236 of his *Amphilochia*, relates Jacob’s pillar with Christ “the cornerstone” (λίθος...ἀκρογωνιαίος) joining in him the two people – Jews and gentiles.⁷⁴⁷ This text is echoed in the visual connection between Jacob’s pillar and the column on the cornerstone plinth on folio 174v of cod. Paris. gr. 510.

There is also another miniature in this manuscript which seems to make use of the symbol of the column, although not in relation to Christ but to Gregory Nazianzenus. Folio 452r presents scenes from the hierarch’s life, amongst which, in the middle register, Gregory’s consecration as bishop of Constantinople in 381 (fig. 179).⁷⁴⁸ At the far right of the composition appears a blue column, topped by a cross and swaged with red drapery.⁷⁴⁹ Papastavrou has proposed that this iconographic element may have been intended to symbolize either the Church, or Gregory himself as pillar of Orthodoxy.⁷⁵⁰ Both interpretations are in accordance with commonplace expressions of Christian literature: the Church is “pillar and foundation of the truth” (*I.Timothy* 3:15) or, by inversion of the biblical passage, the truth is “pillar and foundation of the Church”.⁷⁵¹ Likewise, various saints are called pillars of the faith, of

⁷⁴⁶ The biblical use of the cornerstone as symbol of Christ is also found in *Matthew* 21:42, *Mark* 12:10, *Luke* 20:17, and *Acts* 4:11 (all of which quote Psalm 117:22), as well as in *Isaiah* 28:16. References to the “living stone” or the stone at the foundation of Zion, again as symbols of Christ, are found in *Isaiah* 8:14, *Romans* 9:32-33 and *I.Peter* 2:4-8. For the exegetical tradition on these passages and the interpretation of this cornerstone as a foundation-stone rather than a coping-stone see Ladner (1983), 171-196. See also Lampe (1961), 66, “ἀκρογωνιαίος”, 2; and 802-803, “λίθος”, B.2.

⁷⁴⁷ Ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI.1, 18. This text is also mentioned by Brubaker (1999), 209, to prove that Photios considered Jacob’s pillar a type of Christ.

⁷⁴⁸ Omont (1929), 31, pl. LX; Brubaker (1999), 134-37, fig. 46.

⁷⁴⁹ Brubaker (1999), 136, considers it a device that enables the artist to align Gregory’s portrayals vertically, almost in the middle of each register.

⁷⁵⁰ Papastavrou (1989), 149.

⁷⁵¹ Lampe (1961), 1265, “στῦλος”, 4.

the Church etc.⁷⁵² If the column on folio 452r of cod. Paris. gr. 510 has indeed a symbolic significance, it is logical to suppose that the makers and users of the codex were aware of the symbolism of the column in other contexts as well. Therefore, the Christological interpretation of the column in the lower register of folio 174v seems a logical possibility.

We may conclude this discussion by allowing that the column that appears in such a prominent position in the scene of David's anointing on folio 174v of cod. Paris. gr. 510 was probably intended as a symbol of Christ. It is significant that in the tenth-century cod. Paris. gr. 139, folio 3v, and cod. Vat. Reg. gr. 1, folio 263r, the same peculiar building with a single column at the corner of it appears as part of the composition of David's unction (figs 180-81).⁷⁵³ However, there the edifice does not stand behind Samuel and David in as prominent a position as in cod. Paris. gr. 510, but is partly concealed behind David's brothers. It therefore seems more of a plain architectural feature than a Christological symbol.

A case can be made out that in specially designed compositions, such as the Sinai mosaic and the Paris. gr. 510 miniature, the column was used to symbolize Christ and was part of a complex theological construction to convey the Incarnation and Jesus' two natures. The Sinai mosaic was viewed by a wide audience of monks and pilgrims, and its designer will have expected at least part of that audience to comprehend the theological symbolism of the mosaic ensemble.⁷⁵⁴ Cod. Paris. gr. 510, on the other hand, was addressed to a much more restricted audience, being a gift from Patriarch Photios to Basil I. Although this emperor was certainly nothing as learned as Photios, they both belonged to the highest ranks of Byzantine society, where people were familiar with the symbolic nuances in the rich visual language of imperial and religious art and ceremonial that were the principle elements of their cultural environment.⁷⁵⁵ The sophisticated imagery of the entire cod. Paris. gr. 510 provides a fitting context for the symbolic interpretation of the column as a reference to Christ in the background of David's anointment on folio 174v.

⁷⁵² Lampe (1961), 1265, "στῦλος", 5.

⁷⁵³ Brubaker (1999), 188, figs 96-97.

⁷⁵⁴ Elsner (1995), 99-124, esp. 118-124; Weitzmann (1982), 13-14.

⁷⁵⁵ Brubaker (1999), 412-16. For the sophisticated visual language of court art and ceremonial (on which the *Book of Ceremonies* by Constantine Porphyrogenetos, ed. Vogt [1935], gives valuable information) see, for example, Cameron (1987); Jolivet-Lévy (1987); *Byzantine Court Culture* (1997); Maguire (1997).

The illustration of the Chludov Psalter presents analogous elements of sophistication, abounding in iconographic peculiarities that in the light of the Byzantine literary tradition seem intended to convey a multi-faceted message. If this codex was indeed produced and used in a restricted circle of militant and high-ranking iconophile churchmen familiar with the complexities of literary and visual exegesis,⁷⁵⁶ it is logical to suppose that a prominent iconographic element like the central column of the ciborium on folio 9v was not a random choice, but may belong to the same tradition as that to which the Sinai mosaic and the miniature of cod. Paris. gr. 510 have been assigned. The veil drawn to the sides of the ciborium to reveal the central column may signify that the veil of Christ's flesh, torn at the time of his death, was later restored with his Resurrection so as to reveal the Incarnated Logos (the column) in all the glory of his two natures, human and divine. The prominence of the column right above the theophany of the resurrected Jesus is analogous to the placement of the column above the theophanic image of Christ transfigured in the Sinai mosaic.

This interpretation is supported by another miniature in the Chludov Psalter - the Communion of the apostles on folio 115r. (fig. 153). In this miniature, Christ standing in the middle below the ciborium conceals the two central columns, leaving visible only the two lateral ones. But because the arches spanning the columns of the ciborium converge above his head, his upright figure seems to be the central column that supports the whole structure. This spatial arrangement may have been intended to deliberately enhance the symbolism of the scene. The Communion of the apostles is considered the liturgical version of the Last Supper,⁷⁵⁷ celebrating the institution of the Church through the establishment of its most venerable mystery, and focal point of all its activities, the Eucharist.⁷⁵⁸ In the Chludov Psalter the miniature on folio 115r illustrates Psalm 109:4, "...thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedek", which in apostolic and patristic exegesis is a reference to the priesthood of Christ and through him of the Christian Church.⁷⁵⁹ The scene of the Communion of the apostles is flanked by the figure of David, the psalmist, on the left, and Melchisedek on the right. The composition reminds one of the passage from *Emphesians* 2:19-21: "...you are...members of God's household, built on the

⁷⁵⁶ Corrigan (1992), 129-139.

⁷⁵⁷ Mandas (2001), 125-134.

⁷⁵⁸ Cf. Taft (1997), 143-160.

⁷⁵⁹ Corrigan (1992), 55-59.

foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone. In him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord.” Emblematic of the institution of the Church, the miniature in fact shows the apostles, a prophet, and a forerunner of Christ, and Jesus himself in the middle behind the altar and below the ciborium, which stand for the Holy of Holies of the Christian church, as though he is supporting the structure like the central column. He is indeed represented as “the pillar and foundation of the truth” in the house of the living God (*I. Timothy* 3:15). “In him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord” (*Emphesians* 2:21).

Some scholars have objected that the depiction of Old Testament prefigurations of Christ was unacceptable to iconophiles.⁷⁶⁰ This is surely incorrect. It is true that in the 82nd canon of the Quinisext Ecumenical Council of 692 is stated that the image of the Lamb of God should be replaced by the figure of Christ himself, since depictions of the Incarnated Logos are to be preferred to his Old Testament prefigurations, just as the truth of the Grace is preferable to the shadows of the Law.⁷⁶¹ However, the canon does not prohibit altogether the use of Old Testament types of Jesus in art. It simply orders that, although they are venerable, they should not be preferred over Christ’s own images, which are more venerable still.⁷⁶² The iconophiles cited this canon very frequently in order to prove that the veneration of icons belonged to the tradition of the Church and was sanctioned by an ecumenical council before the outbreak of iconoclasm.⁷⁶³ They never used it against the depiction of Old Testament types but, on the contrary, included the latter in their polemics, saying that if the Incarnation was prefigured indirectly in material yet venerable symbols (such as the golden censer, the jar with the manna, the ark and the rod of Aaron), after its fulfilment it should be depicted directly in the venerable although material icons of Christ.⁷⁶⁴ They also claimed that, if the objects kept in the Holy of Holies were sacred despite their materiality and had nothing to do with idols (given

⁷⁶⁰ For example, Papastavrou (1989), 154, 160.

⁷⁶¹ See p. 50, n. 90 above.

⁷⁶² See also Jolivet-Lévy (1993-94).

⁷⁶³ See p. 50, n. 90 above. For the ecumenical status of the council in Trullo in Byzantium see Dură (1995).

⁷⁶⁴ For example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 86 (I.13), 88-89 (I.15:17-32), 121-22 (II.22:20-II:23), 155 (I.53, II.49, III.51); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 962-63, *Mansi* XIII, 4D-5E; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 765-68, 784-88, 792A. See also Kessler (1991-92).

that God himself had ordered their manufacture), the same can be said of icons, which completely invalidates the iconoclast equation of icons with idols as unjustified.⁷⁶⁵

The marginal psalters have many miniatures that can be related to this argumentation. Christ's Old Testament types, like the rock uncut by human hands (fig. 184),⁷⁶⁶ the rock struck by Moses to produce water (figs 182-83),⁷⁶⁷ and the unicorn,⁷⁶⁸ are depicted alone or next to Christ's icon; Jesus is represented next to an Old Testament character that was considered his antetype, like Solomon,⁷⁶⁹ or Melchisedek (fig. 153).⁷⁷⁰ In one instance Christ himself is shown teaching the Jews the true meaning of his Old Testament prefiguration: he appears after the miracle of the manna saying that he is the true bread of life (*John* 6:22-58).⁷⁷¹ All these cases demonstrate that the iconophiles were not at all opposed to the depiction of Christ's prefigurations, but rather used them in their textual and visual polemics in support of images. The veil and the column on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter belongs to the same practice of constructing a Christological discourse by combining Old Testament prefigurations and their fulfilment in the image of the Incarnated Logos.⁷⁷²

Kessler's "Medieval Art as Argument", is an important recent discussion on the methodology of reading iconography with implications for the present study.⁷⁷³ He comments on "art's capacity to assimilate more than one textual sources within a coherent and plausible narrative" and its advantage to permit "both the Old Testament prefigurement and its Christian realisation to operate simultaneously, and within a

⁷⁶⁵ See, for example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 88 (I.15:1-17), 91-93 (I.16:40-I.17), 95-97 (I.20; II.9/III.9, 104-106 (II.13:9-II.14), 118 (I.27:16-18), 120 (II.22:7-11, with reference to the Temple veil), 122 (III.11:9-10), 174 (III.73), *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 206 (89, IV.16:9-15); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 962C-E, 1070AB/E, *Mansi* XIII, 44B-D, 52CD, 285AB; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 445-457 (about the difference between idols and sacred objects), *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 769AB, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 164/171-73 (§92:27-43/242-295), 265 (§165:29-31); Theodore the Studite, *Antirrhetici I-II*, PG 99, 333B-336B, 380B; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), II, 127-28 (epistle 219:25-31, reference to the various Temple veils). In a seventh-century Armenian treatise in support of icon veneration the Temple veil is mentioned together with other sacred objects of the Jews to emphasize that materiality does not exclude holiness, as in the case of icons (ed. Der Nersessian [1944-45], 59; mentioned also by Kessler [1993], 66, n. 40).

⁷⁶⁶ Chludov Psalter, folio 64r (fig. 184); Pantokrator Psalter, folio 83v. Corrigan (1992), 37-40.

⁷⁶⁷ Chludov Psalter, folio 82r (fig. 182); Pantokrator Psalter, folio 114r (fig. 183). Corrigan (1992), 91.

⁷⁶⁸ Chludov Psalter, folio 93v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 109v. Corrigan (1992), 25, 76.

⁷⁶⁹ Pantokrator Psalter, folio 93v. Corrigan (1992), 71-72.

⁷⁷⁰ Chludov Psalter, folio 115r (fig. 153); cod. Petropolitanus 265 (four leaves taken from the Pantokrator Psalter), folio 4v; Paris marginal Psalter, folio 25r. Corrigan 55-59.

⁷⁷¹ Chludov Psalter, folio 76v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 105r. Corrigan (1992), 50-51.

⁷⁷² Cf. three miniatures of the fourteenth-century cod. B 8 of the Evangelical School in Smyrna (destroyed in 1922) where an icon with the Virgin and Child is painted above the burning bush, the golden jar with the manna, and the tabernacle, all biblical types of Mary, Kessler (1991-92), 57-60, figs 6, 8-9.

⁷⁷³ Kessler (1993).

context that suggests historical reality”.⁷⁷⁴ In other words, art can work as visual exegesis, and for this reason works of art, or the different stages in the procedure of artistic production, were often used in exegetical literature to elucidate an argument. Elaborating on *Hebrews* 10:1, “For the Law contains but a shadow (*σκιά*), no true image (*εἰκὼν*), of the good things which were to come,” various authors like John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Kosmas Indikopleustes compared the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New to the creation of an image by adding colours (*χρώματα*) to the preliminary drawings (*σκιαγραφίαι*).⁷⁷⁵

That this argument was known to the iconophiles is seen in their claim that the symbols and objects of the Jewish religion were shadowy images of Christ’s Incarnation which, after its fulfilment in the New Testament, could and should be declared and manifested in Jesus’ icons.⁷⁷⁶ Shortly before the outbreak of Iconoclasm, the Fathers of the Council in Trullo of 692 had ordered in the 82nd Canon that images of Christ should replace his symbolic representation in the figure of the Lamb, exactly as the truth of the New Testament had replaced the shadow of the Old.⁷⁷⁷ Kessler considers the veil of the Temple as a symbol of this line of argumentation, since according to the textual tradition mentioned above, the tearing of the *καταπέτασμα* during Christ’s Passion signified the revelation of the New Testament truth in replacement to the Old Testament shadow. Kessler sees these ideas as visually depicted on folio 89r of cod. Vat. gr. 699 (fig. 11), a ninth-century copy of the *Christian Topography* by Kosmas Indikopleustes, where through an opening in the veil of the firmament (represented as the diapered veil of the Temple known from other miniatures) is a figure of Christ. To the same ideas he relates some representations of the *Mandylion*, a holy relic sometimes depicted as the diapered veil of the Temple on which shines Christ’s image.⁷⁷⁸

The *Mandylion* was often mentioned in iconophile literature to prove that Jesus himself had sanctioned his depiction in images,⁷⁷⁹ but this famous

⁷⁷⁴ Kessler (1993), 59, 61; also Kessler (1991-92), 54.

⁷⁷⁵ Kessler (1993), 60-62.

⁷⁷⁶ For example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 155 (I.53, II.49, III.51). See also Kessler (1993), 62.

⁷⁷⁷ Kessler (1993), 61-62; also Kessler (1991-92).

⁷⁷⁸ Kessler (1993), 62-70; also Kessler (1991-92), 61-64.

⁷⁷⁹ Examples in: John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 145-46 (I.33/II.29/III.45), *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 208 (89, VI.16:51-56); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 963D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 14 (§7:44-56), 141 (§82:27-41), 293 (§184:56-60), 322 (§201:20-21); Theodore the Studite,

acheiropoietos icon does not seem to have been represented in the ninth-century marginal psalters. One question is whether the depiction of Christ's Tomb in the miniature of folio 9v in the Chludov Psalter might be related to the same ideas and the same exegetical tradition that Kessler traces in his study. As the shadow of the Old Testament has been replaced by the truth of the New through Christ's Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection, so in the same way the Jewish Temple has been replaced by the Holy Sepulchre, the veil of the Holy of Holies has been replaced by Christ's flesh through which the godhead has manifested itself to people, and the sacred objects of the tabernacle have been replaced by Christ's icons. To conclude, if the curtains drawn to the sides of the ciborium on folio 9v can be related to the veil of the Temple being divided to reveal the Incarnated Logos, the iconophile connotations of the miniature result manifold: Christ's Incarnation, the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New, the replacement of the shadows of the Law by the truth of Grace, the resulting superiority of Christ's images to the images of his types, the venerability of icons despite their material and man-made nature, are basic iconophile arguments recalled by the iconographic element in question.

Some of these ideas are also explicitly or implicitly presented in the miniature on folio 165r of the Pantokrator Psalter (fig. 19): in front of a representation of the Holy of Holies with all the venerable objects it contained barred from view by the spread veil, the iconoclast John the Grammarian is seen arguing with David and Bezaleel, the Temple artist, about the issue of idols.⁷⁸⁰ In this miniature the veil is very prominently depicted as closing the entrance to the Holy of Holies, where the presence of God was manifested through symbols. When the veil was torn at Christ's death, the presence of God was manifested directly through the revelation of the Incarnated Logos. Icons are also a doorway through which the faithful experience the Incarnation, revelation and presence of Christ.⁷⁸¹ In this sense, the veil drawn aside to reveal the central column on folio 9v of the Chludov Psalter can itself be considered symbolic of icons revealing the Incarnated Logos. Similarly the veil of the *Mandylion* spread out to reveal the image of Christ miraculously imprinted on it is itself also a

Epistulae, ed. Fatouros (1992), 570 (epistle 409:41-44); George the Monk, *Chronikon*, ed. Wirth (1978), 740:17-22, 785:3; *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 171:482-84, 172-73; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 99:18-19 (§9); *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 177B; *Life of Euthymios of Sardis*, ed. Gouillard (1978), 35:179-87 (§9). See Kessler (1993), 66, notes 39-40 for basic bibliography on the *Mandylion*; see also *Holy Face* (1998).

⁷⁸⁰ Corrigan (1992), 33-35.

⁷⁸¹ Cf. Kessler (1991).

symbol of icons that manifest God by depicting the veil of his flesh. In both cases the symbolism works through the vehicle of the veil. Whether opened or closed, it always signifies Christ's human nature through which the divinity became manifest. However, the opened version particularly emphasizes the sense of revelation, of theophany, and thus highlights all those iconophile arguments related to the dogma of Christ's two natures (the depiction of his humanity and the manifestation of his divinity in an unconfused and undivided unity).

The multiple connotations of the ciborium, the veil and the central column that appear in the miniature of folio 9v in the Chludov Psalter make this composition an excellent example of what Kessler has termed "Medieval Art as Argument" or visual exegesis. Despite its simplicity (consisting of only two figures and a simple architectural construction) the miniature demonstrates an extraordinary multiplicity of meanings, at the heart of which stands the revelation of the Incarnated Logos for the salvation of mankind. Christ's body as the temple of his divinity is alluded to by the ciborium. Christ's flesh as the veil which at the same time conceals and reveals God is alluded to by the pulled-back curtains that disclose the true Holy of Holies: the Sepulchre where Jesus defeated death. Christ's Old Testament type, the column referring to Jacob's anointed pillar, becomes the symbol of the Incarnated Logos as revealed by the veil of his flesh at the time of his Resurrection. All the elements of this composition – David the forefather and prophet, Jesus awakened from the sleep of death, the Holy Sepulchre depicted in a form reminiscent of the Temple, the symbols of the veil and the column – manifest the truth of the Incarnation and Christ's two natures: they create a sophisticated matrix of cross-references between the Christological prophesy in the Old Testament text of the psalm, its fulfilment in the New Testament episode of the Resurrection, and the pictorial depiction of Christ's victory over death.

This novel iconography of the Resurrection proves in the most effective way that icons, contrary to iconoclast accusations, not only respect the most basic dogma of the Orthodox Church (the hypostatic union of Christ's two natures), but by also manifesting it attest to their venerability and their didactic validity. This iconography presents many affiliations with not only iconophile texts, but also basic themes and expressions of Early Christian and Byzantine theology and the rich symbolic vocabulary of Byzantine art generally. It reflects the fact that iconophile polemics, both in the literary and the visual form, was rooted in an extensive and long-lived cultural

tradition, which in the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters produced some of its most sophisticated expressions. Other examples of this learned production are the scenes of the Anastasis that will be analysed in the next section.

III.2.2 The Anastasis (Chludov Psalter, folios 63r, 63v, 82v, 100v; Pantokrator Psalter, folio 83r; Paris marginal Psalter, folio 19v)

The Descent of Christ to Hades or, in Byzantine terms the Anastasis, is depicted four times in the Chludov Psalter (initially perhaps five, judging by the Theodore and Barberini Psalters),⁷⁸² and once in the Pantokrator Psalter.⁷⁸³ One more representation is to be found among the few surviving folios of the Paris marginal Psalter.⁷⁸⁴ The general iconophile references which have been discussed already in the context of Christ's Resurrection, are equally applicable for the Anastasis: the emphasis on Jesus' two natures inherent in the theme of the scene (Jesus overcoming through his divine nature death experienced by his human nature) is a declaration that icons are able to not only respect but also attest to the central dogma of Orthodox belief in the hypostatic union of human and divine in Christ's person. However, by depicting a moment of the Resurrection that is different from that of Christ rising from the Tomb, the iconography of the Anastasis emphasises particular iconophile evocations.

The main figures in the Anastasis miniatures of the ninth-century marginal psalters are Christ treading Hades underfoot while raising up Adam and Eve (figs 185, 186, 191). As already mentioned, Orthodox theology accepted that during the three days that Christ's body lay in the Tomb, his human soul, together with his divine nature, descended to Hades in order to defeat death. So in the Anastasis scenes Jesus is not depicted in body and soul emerging from the place where he had been circumscribed for three days. What is shown instead is Christ's human soul (in the form of his human figure), glowing with the light of his divinity as he tramples on Hades and saves the souls of Adam and Eve from the realm of death. The depiction of Jesus at the moment when only his human soul can be perceived as participating in

⁷⁸² Folios 63r, 63v, 82v, and 100v. For the evidence from the two eleventh-century psalters see p. 164, n. 578 above.

⁷⁸³ Folio 83r, Dufrenne (1966), 26-27, pl. 10

⁷⁸⁴ Folio 19v, Dufrenne (1996), 45, pl. 43.

the events represented, and not his human body, is a particularly strong iconophile statement, which has not, in my opinion, been sufficiently appreciated in the art historical literature.

In fact, iconophile arguments on the representability of the soul sometimes contradict each other. For example, in the treatise of John of Damascus against iconoclasts and in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council it is stated that it is impossible to depict the soul (given that it is an immaterial and invisible entity), therefore it is even more impossible to depict God, which is the absolute spiritual and immaterial essence.⁷⁸⁵ This argument is used against the iconoclast claim that when Christ's human nature is shown in images, his divine nature is also circumscribed.⁷⁸⁶ Relevant to the question of the soul's representability is also the iconophile refutation of the other basic iconoclast claim that if Christ's humanity is depicted while his divinity remains invisible, then the two natures are divided and the dogma of their hypostatic union in Christ is violated. As mentioned before, a commonplace iconophile argument against this accusation was that when a man is depicted in an image, his invisible soul is not depicted, but this does not result to it being divided from the man's body (a division that occurs only at the time of death).⁷⁸⁷

While these statements suggest that it is impossible to depict the human soul in images, another iconophile argument reverses this conclusion, by claiming that even the human souls and the angelic or demonic spiritual entities can be pictorially rendered because they are immaterial only by comparison with the human body, but in terms of the absolute immaterial, spiritual, and invisible essence of God they can be considered material, therefore representable. It is worth noting that this reasoning in favour of the depiction of the soul is recorded even in the treatise against the iconoclasts by John of Damascus and the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council,⁷⁸⁸ that in another occasion make exactly the opposite statement, as we have seen.

⁷⁸⁵ *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 78 (I.4/III.6:82-88); *Mansi* XIII, 340E. Also Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 461C, notes that in Christ's icons is depicted his human body and not his invisible soul, let alone his divine nature.

⁷⁸⁶ See pp. 122, n. 400 above.

⁷⁸⁷ See pp. 65 (n. 157), 122 (401) above. For the division of body and soul at the time of human death, a point frequently repeated in patristic literature to emphasize that Christ died as man, see for example Athanasios of Alexandria, *De corpore et anima (spuria)*, PG 28, 1433C; Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui spatio (Sermones)*, ed. Heil et alii (1967), 294:2-4; Patriarch Germanos, *In dominici corporis sepulturam*, PG 98, 260C; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 276A. See also Kartsonis (1986), 36, n. 68.

⁷⁸⁸ *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 130-132 (III.24-25); *Mansi* XIII, 164C-165D, esp. 165B (mentioned by Kartsonis [1986], 72; trans. Mango [1986]140-41). Also Theodore the

The representability of spiritual entities was frequently mentioned in iconophile texts specifically in the case of angels⁷⁸⁹ – beings that in Christian thought are considered of the same class with souls and demons.⁷⁹⁰ The usual conclusion in the relevant iconophile references is that if it is possible to depict in images these spiritual entities, it is even more justifiable to depict Christ in his material human nature.⁷⁹¹ Moreover, following the iconophile argument that whatever is visible is also representable,⁷⁹² it can be also claimed that it is possible to depict Christ's soul as he defeats Hades, given that while he was doing so he was seen by our first parents and a number of the Just.⁷⁹³ According to this way of thinking, the scenes of the Anastasis in the ninth-century marginal psalters are among the most aggressively iconophile visual statements of these codices, declaring above all that if Christ's soul can be depicted in images, so can his body in all the scenes of his earthly life among the people who, according to the gospel stories, actually saw and touched and spoke with him.

Kartsonis has noted that Hades in the Anastasis miniatures of the ninth-century marginal psalters is rendered as a huge and repulsive figure, and has suggested that this may carry iconophile connotations. She takes into consideration the iconoclast claim that icons induce Christians to impiety because, when Christ is shown next to evil figures, such as Hades or the devil in the scene of the Anastasis, the reverence conferred on him by the beholder of the icon is shared also by the sinister participants of the composition. Kartsonis, therefore, considers the emphatic depiction of Hades in the miniatures in question an aggressive iconophile answer to

Studite, *Antirrheticus III*, PG 412A-C, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 177 (epistle 64:36-37), in both cases mentioning specifically angels. Cf. Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 26 (II.1:58-60), where it is said that only God is uncreated and impossible to define, while angles, souls, and demons, being created and invisible, are difficult to define.

⁷⁸⁹ See pp. 156-57 above.

⁷⁹⁰ Parry (1996), 82. This idea is also inherent in the two passages by Anastasios of Sinai mentioned in n. 788 above.

⁷⁹¹ For example, John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores*, ed. Kotter (1975), 133 (III.26:29-32, reference to angels); Acts of Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi XIII*, 164C-165D (reference to angels, demons, and souls), 184AB (reference to the Holy Ghost); Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus II*, PG 365AB (reference to angels and souls), *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 781A-C (reference to angels); Theodore the Studite, *Refutatio et subversio*, PG 99, 412 A-C, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 177 (epistle 64:36-37), 533-534 (385:11-14), 536 (386:50-51), all making reference to angels.

⁷⁹² See p. 170, n. 609 above.

⁷⁹³ In various texts of Orthodox theology (although not in iconophile literature in particular) it is said that the souls of the dead saw Christ's human soul in the underworld, and through it perceived his invisible divine nature defeating Hades. (A biblical passage upon which such statements are bases is *I. Peter* 3:18-19, "He was put to death in the body but made alive by the Spirit, through whom also he went and preached to the spirits in prison.") Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi IV*, 648A-B/E; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 233 (XIII.6:44-62).

the above accusation, in line with the supporters of icons saying that honour is paid to only the holy figures represented in images, not the impious ones who by the very subject of the scenes depicted are condemned as examples to be avoided and rejected.⁷⁹⁴

An additional explanation is offered by a passage in the third *Antirrheticus* by Patriarch Nikephoros. Discussing this same issue, Nikephoros says that by showing such evil figures (as Hades) being defeated by Christ, Orthodox Christians not only condemn them but emphatically praise their Saviour for his glorious victory over such enemies. In other words, the more terrible Christ's defeated enemies are, the greater is his triumph in the salvation of mankind.⁷⁹⁵ Such considerations may have lain behind the choice to depict Hades in the ninth-century marginal psalters as a gigantic and monstrous figure: it emphasizes the greatness of Christ's victory over death, and so is an emphatic manifestation of his divinity that enabled his human soul to vanquish the lord of the underworld. In this sense the iconography again expresses the iconophile dictum that icons both respect and declare the dogma of Christ's two natures in one hypostasis.

In the remainder of this section some new suggestions will be made about possible iconophile allusions of the Anastasis miniatures in ninth-century marginal psalters, among them an additional interpretation concerning the figure of Hades. The analysis will be focused on the miniature with the rarest iconography, since it can lead to conclusions that might offer a key to the symbolical, typological significance of all the Anastasis scenes in the ninth-century marginal psalters.⁷⁹⁶

Christ raising Holy Zion (Chludov Psalter, folio 100v)

Folio 100v (fig. 187) of the Chludov Psalter has a very unusual representation of the Anastasis, illustrating Psalm 101:14: "Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion; for it is time to have mercy upon her, for the set time is come." Christ is seen treading on Hades, the vanquished lord of the underworld. Next to Christ, instead of

⁷⁹⁴ Kartsonis (1986), 139-40. She also relates the obesity of Hades in the ninth-century psalters with references of Byzantine hymns and homilies to his insatiable and all-devouring nature.

⁷⁹⁵ PG 100, 436D.

⁷⁹⁶ Also presented in the Second Meeting of the Byzantinologists of Greece and Cyprus, Evangelatou (2000a).

Adam and Eve who in the standard iconography await to be raised from the dead, is a church-building inscribed *H AΓΙΑ CIΩN* (the Holy Zion) and a female figure personifying it. Christ holds out his hands towards her as if about to raise her out of the grave. Hades, whom both Christ and the church crush, is lying in a dark, rectangular pit or sarcophagus (largely erased) symbolizing the realm of death.⁷⁹⁷ Behind Christ is the inscription *ANACTACIC*. Indeed, Psalm 101:14 was interpreted as referring to Christ's Resurrection in the psalm commentaries by Eusebios and Hesychios.⁷⁹⁸

Grabar suggested that the church of Zion and its female personification signify not the terrestrial city but the ideal, celestial one, synonymous with paradise where Christ entered after his Resurrection;⁷⁹⁹ he proposes that the scene symbolizes the universal redemption achieved through Jesus' victory over death. Observing that it does not appear anywhere but in the Chludov Psalter, Grabar considers the iconography "unsuccessful", although not lacking a certain "grandeur".⁸⁰⁰ Indeed, this peculiar scene reappears only on folios 134v and 171r of the Theodore and Barberini Psalters respectively, that draw their models from the Chludov Psalter (fig. 188).⁸⁰¹ The following analysis will attempt to pinpoint the possible iconophile allusions of this iconography to see whether any specific polemical significance justifies its rare appearance.

The key to the decipherment of this miniature is the meaning of the church building and its female personification. According to the wording of the verse illustrated ("Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion"), and the features of the composition itself (an Anastasis scene in which Adam and Eve are replaced by "Holy Zion"), it is doubtful that, as Grabar has suggested, what is represented here is Christ entering the heavenly city of paradise after his Resurrection. An alternative reading is that Christ is raising Holy Zion from the realm of death (as Psalm 101:14 also implies). On this reading, it is impossible to see her as the ideal world where the Just will dwell in afterlife, a place untouched by the darkness of death. She may, however, be associated with another meaning that is often attributed to the name of Zion and

⁷⁹⁷ Cf. the almost identical, mirror-image composition on folio 134v of the Theodore Psalter (fig. 188), where the scene is better preserved.

⁷⁹⁸ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 1257CD; *In psalmos*, PG 93, 1276A. Cf. also Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 428D, and John Chrysostom, *In psalmos (spuria)*, PG 55, 638, both on Psalm 101:15.

⁷⁹⁹ Grabar (1980-81), 12-3.

⁸⁰⁰ Grabar (1980-81), 12.

⁸⁰¹ Nersessian (1970), 48, fig. 217; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 120.

fits in with the notion of salvation from death. Various patristic texts (such as psalm commentaries, homilies, Acts of the ecumenical councils as well as iconophile writings) often identify Holy Zion with the ecumenical Church – whose members have hope of eternal life through Christ’s Resurrection – or to the pious and holy beliefs of Christianity.⁸⁰² Zion is identified with the Christian Church even in certain patristic commentaries on Psalm 101, although not in relation to verse 14 illustrated in the Chludov Psalter, but in relation to verse 17, “For the Lord shall built up Zion”.⁸⁰³ On folio 86v of the Chludov Psalter itself the city of Holy Zion is shown with an icon of the Virgin and Child hanging from its walls, probably symbolizing, among other things, the veneration of icons in the ecumenical Orthodox Church, as does a similar miniature on folio 121r of the Pantokrator Psalter (figs 189-90).⁸⁰⁴

Moreover, the same patristic texts mentioned above often compare heresy to Hades and death itself threatening to vanquish Christ’s bride, finally defeated according to the Lord’s promise that “on this rock (Peter) I will build my church and the gates of Hades will not overcome it” (*Matthew* 16:18).⁸⁰⁵ Bearing this in mind, the miniature on folio 100v of the Chludov Psalter may be read to symbolize not only the foundation and erection of the Christian Church through Christ’s final victory over death, but also the subsequent salvation of the Church every time she has with the help of the Lord overcome a deadly heresy that threatened to imprison her inside the gates of Hades. In combination with the iconophile overtone of other miniatures of the

⁸⁰² (Cf. *Hebrews* 12:22-23, “But you have come to Mount Zion...the church of the firstborn...”) Examples by: Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), I, 355:19-20 (§503, Psalm 47:13-15), II, 50:1-4 (§652, Psalm 64:2-3), 226-27 (§974, Psalm 101:22), 314:4-7 (§1185, Psalm 131:13-14); Cyril of Alexandria, *In psalmos*, PG 69, 768D (Psalm 9:12), 1065A (Psalm 37:12), 1101D (Psalm 50:20), 1128A (Psalm 64:2), 1177A (Psalm 68:36-37), 1212A (Psalm 86:1); Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 928C (Psalm 9:15), 1216BC (Psalm 47:12-14), 1348A (Psalm 64:2-3), 1656BC (Psalm 96:8), 1668C (Psalm 98:9); Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 4AB, 380A; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 628AB (with reference to the Resurrection, after which Christ rules on Mount Zion, his Church), 660AB/D, 661B; (Cf. Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros [1992], 407 (epistle 275:39-40), 827 (547:15-17). See also Lampe (1961), 1234, “Σιών”, B.1.

⁸⁰³ Pseudo-Athanasios, *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 1081C; Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), II, 225 (§971); John Chrysostom, *In psalmos (spuria)*, PG 55, 638 (identical to the comment by Didymos); Hesychios, *In psalmos*, PG 93, 1276C.

⁸⁰⁴ See also Corrigan (1992), 98; and Lidov (1998), 343-44, for another approach to the Chludov miniature on folio 86v.

⁸⁰⁵ Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1108DE, *Mansi* V, 184E; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 668C, 717A; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 41, 993C, PG 42, 501B; John Chrysostom, *In pentecosten I (spuria)*, PG 52, 806-808, *In incarnationem domini (spuria)*, PG 59, 700; Anastasios of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. Uthermann (1981), 136 (IX.1:56), 268 (XV.91-96); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 87 (epistle 35:16-17), 95 (50:8-9/13-14), III, 8 (284:168-70), 142 (291:95-96). For examples in iconophile texts see below, notes 810-12.

Chludov Psalter, this scene would allude to the resurrection of the Orthodox Church after the defeat of iconoclasm. This can be supported by further evidence.

To associate heresy with death and the victory of Orthodoxy with the resurrection of the Church is based on a fundamental Christian belief that appears as a *topos* in patristic literature, iconophile texts included: because sin causes the death of the soul (which is much worse than the death of the body), everything and everybody that can induce man to sin eventually leads him to his spiritual death (the same death of sin that Christ abolished with his Passion and Resurrection).⁸⁰⁶ Heresy is obviously a deadly sin, because it fights against the true faith of Christ, the only one who can save humanity from perdition. The dissemination of a heretic belief, therefore, causes the spiritual death of all its victims,⁸⁰⁷ while the defeat of heresy brings back to life all who are again received into the true Orthodox faith, and frees the Christian Church from the bonds of darkness, raising it again to its previous glory and purity.⁸⁰⁸

Iconoclasm was considered by iconophiles one of the worst heresies ever to threaten the flock of Christ; in fact it was sometimes said to be *the* worst.⁸⁰⁹ So, it is

⁸⁰⁶ (Cf. *Romans* 7:22-8:2, where sin and death are directly related). Some examples: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 645A; Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 573C; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 361E; John Chrysostom, *De resurrectione Christi*, PG 50, 438-39, *In caeco nato, (spuria)*, PG 59, 546; Cyril of Alexandria, *Festive Letters*, SC 372, 151 (I.2:77-78), 224 (II.7:62-70), SC 392, 110 (VIII.6:122-25), 256/260 (XI.2:55-60/103-104), *In psalmos*, PG 69, 841B (Psalm 22:4), 881B (Psalm 32:19); Theodoret, *In psalmos*, PG 80, 1244B (Psalm 50:7), 1809D (Psalm 114:8-9), 1832A (Psalm 118:28); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 467 (epistle 324:7-8); Patriarch Photios, *Biblioteca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), IV, 138:19-20. See also Lampe (1961), 512, “*θάνατος*”, B.2-4.

⁸⁰⁷ Examples of heretics afflicted by spiritual death or causing others to experience it: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 624A, *Mansi* V, 261E-264A, 385A; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 493A, 494A, 660DE; Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), I, 47 (epistle 2:220), III, 16 (284:443-45).

⁸⁰⁸ Examples in: Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 1464D; Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IX, 933D. See also the passages in n. 805 above (the gates of Hades, i.e. heresy, do not overcome the Church). A most characteristic example of the comparison between the prevalence of Orthodoxy and the victory over death in Byzantine mentality is recorded in the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XI, 608A-612B. The monk Polychronios is a heretic who believes that Christ had one will and one energy, contrary to the council Fathers who declare the Orthodox dogma of Christ’s two wills and energies (human and divine). Polychronios asks to place a letter recording his ideas on the corpse of a man, claiming that if the man returns to life, this will be a sign from God that the letter contains a confession to the true dogma. The emperor, the Fathers, and the people of Constantinople gather in the yard of the public baths of “Zeuxippos”, Polychronios places the letter on the body of a dead man and prays for his resuscitation. The miracle is not performed, the people anathematise Polychronios as “the new Simon”, the monk refuses to reject his heretic beliefs, therefore his is also anathematised by the council Fathers. It is worth noting that nobody rejected the validity of the “test”, based on the belief that Orthodoxy is life-giving even in a literal, physical sense.

⁸⁰⁹ For example, Theodore the Studite says that iconoclasm is the worst of all heresies because it denies the Incarnation of the Logos and destroys the churches (*Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros [1992], 594-96 [epistle 425:35-44]), or that it is the result of all heresies put together because of the accusations of idolatry raised by iconoclasts against the Church (*Antirrheticus I*, PG 99, 349B). Patriarch Nikephoros also

very fitting to compare iconoclasm to death, and its defeat to the resurrection of the Orthodox Church. This and similar expressions abound in iconophile sources, where heretics are compared to open graves ready to swallow the souls of the simple-minded,⁸¹⁰ iconoclasm is thought to come from or lead to the realm of Hades,⁸¹¹ and the hope for or satisfaction in the final triumph of Orthodoxy is often expressed by citing *Matthew* 16:18, “and the gates of Hades will not overcome it (the Church)”.⁸¹² The miniature on folio 100v of the Chludov Psalter seems to be visually equating iconoclasm with the realm of death, and the iconophile victory with the resurrection of the Orthodox Church, with both Christ and the church of Zion treading on the vanquished Hades as if to demonstrate that the “gates” of iconoclastic heresy “will not overcome her”.⁸¹³

If this interpretation is correct, one might suppose that the numerous representations of Christ’s Anastasis in the ninth-century marginal psalters are allusions to, among other things, the triumph of Orthodoxy over the “death-like” heresy of iconoclasm. This hypothesis makes more sense if one bears in mind that iconophile texts compare the destruction of icons (or else the most representative manifestation of this heresy) to Christ’s Crucifixion, and this comparison is actually visualized in the Chludov Psalter (folio 67r, fig. 1).⁸¹⁴ In other words, if the destruction of his images is described in terms of a second Passion, then their *Ἀναστήλωσις* (restoration) can be perceived as a second *Ἀνάστασις*.

considers iconoclasm “worst than all heresies”, for example in his *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1992), 305 (§192:8).

⁸¹⁰ For example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 221E (quoting *Matthew* 23:27, “You are like whitewashed tombs, which are beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of dead men’s bones and everything unclean”), 353D; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 217A, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 305 (§192:1-9, iconoclasts speak with Hades’ mouth, like graves); *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 99:4 (§9). Most of the above passages quote Psalms 5:10 and 13:3, “Their throat is an open sepulchre”, employed also in other texts condemning heretics, e.g. in the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* IV, 633C.

⁸¹¹ Examples in: Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XIII, 229A-C, 240DE, 273E, 289E; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 124 (§75:16-17), 272 (§171:15-20); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 215 (epistle 94:15-16), 829 (547:49-51); *Vita Nicephori*, PG 100, 153AB.

⁸¹² For examples see: Patriarch Germanos, *Epistola ad Thomam Caludiopoleos*, PG 98, 169B; Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1002B, 1082E, XIII, 112B, 221B, 328B, 462C; Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 17 (§9:17-27), 303 (§190:18-19); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 190 (epistle 71:29-35), 400 (271:21), 564 (407:11-13), 568 (408:33-35), 580 (415:53-54); *Canon in erectione SS. imaginum*, PG 99, 1777D; *Nouthesia*, ed. Mitsidis (1989), 156:74-75; *Vita Nicephori*, 89CD; *Life of Michael the Synkellos*, ed. Cunningham (1991), 100:1-3.

⁸¹³ The lower part of Hades’ body is almost completely lost, but a shadow indicates that it once stretched below the building of Zion (cf. fig. 188 from the Theodore Psalter).

⁸¹⁴ See pp. 30-31.

There is yet more evidence to show that the Byzantines thought of the defeat of iconoclasm as the resurrection of the Orthodox Church. The most important indication is the timing chosen for the annual commemoration of the final victory of the iconophiles, known as the Triumph of Orthodoxy. From 843 onwards it was (and still is) celebrated on the first Sunday of Lent,⁸¹⁵ a date with a twofold link to Christ's Resurrection: firstly, because in the Orthodox liturgy every Sunday is a commemoration of the Lord's victory over death,⁸¹⁶ and secondly because Lent culminates in Holy Week, preparing the faithful to experience the salvational message and exaltation of the Resurrection.⁸¹⁷ In fact, the opening lines of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* read out during this celebration imply that as Christ's Crucifixion was followed by his Resurrection, the winter of iconoclasm is succeeded by the spring of the triumph of icon veneration.⁸¹⁸

Furthermore, in his homily on Easter Saturday in the year 867, when the new mosaic of the Virgin and Child in the apse of St Sophia was unveiled, Patriarch Photios used the following telling metaphor for the restoration of icons: "This is another shaft being driven today right through the heart of Death, not as the Saviour is engulfed by the tomb of mortality for the common Resurrection of our kind, but as the image of the Mother rises up from the very depths of oblivion, and along with herself raises the likenesses of the saints."⁸¹⁹ In other words, the image of the Virgin and Child comes back to life, resurrecting with it the icons of all the other holy figures of the Church. And in this 'Anastasis' of the icons, death is being defeated as it was on the day of Christ's own Resurrection. It was not coincidence but carefully planned fact that the inauguration of the new apse mosaic took place on Easter Saturday, the time when Christ's confrontation with death and his victory over him is firstly celebrated, before the culmination of the celebrations on Easter Sunday.

⁸¹⁵ *Ttiodion* (1994), 301 ff.

⁸¹⁶ In the 90th canon of the Quinisext Council of 692 it is stated that "From our God-bearing Fathers we have received the canon forbidding us to bend the knee on Sunday, in honour of Christ's resurrection", (ed. and trans. Nedungatt – Featherstone [1995], 170; *Mansi* XI, 981CD. Cf. *Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos (1962-3), II, 170-76, where the gospel lections of every Sunday of the year are related to the Resurrection. See also Taft (1997), 51-72.

⁸¹⁷ Taft (1997), 73-86.

⁸¹⁸ *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, ed. Gouillard (1967), 45:11-19. According to the text, it was winter when the Jews put Christ to death, and winter attacked again the Church (during the iconoclastic heresy), but finally spring has blossomed again. It is a *topos* in patristic literature to compare the Resurrection with the spring. See, for example, Gregory Nazianzenus, *In novam dominicam*, PG 36, 620C, 621A; Gregory of Nyssa, *In sanctum pascha (Sermones)*, ed. Heil et alii (1967), 249:11-12; John Chrysostom, *In Lazarum*, PG 50, 641; Leontios presbyter, *Homilies*, ed. Datema – Allen (1987), 273 (homily IX:9; trans. Allen [1991], 113 [§1]).

⁸¹⁹ Patriarch Photios, *Homilies*, ed. Laourdas (1959), 170:4-9 (homily XVII; trans. Mango [1958], 293).

A story that literally connects the rejection of iconoclast and the return to icon veneration with escape from death is recorded by the tenth-century historian Genesios in his *Reign of the emperors*.⁸²⁰ A certain Manuel *magistros*, uncle of the Empress Theodora, is said to have recovered from an illness that had brought him to the brink of death thanks to his promise to the monks of Studios to restore icon veneration (which he fulfilled through his influence to the empress). The monks said to Manuel: “ ‘If you promise to God that you will restore the ancestral worship of the icons, we confidently bring you the good news that you will live.’ They left, and what had been promised was quickly fulfilled. Incredibly, he evaded death, rising up as though from Hades itself.”⁸²¹ Obviously, the story is fictitious, but most indicative of the Byzantine belief that heresy leads to death and the return to Orthodoxy equals a return to life, even in literal terms. The same episode was copied almost verbatim in the second version of the *Synodikon Vetus*,⁸²² a concise history of Church councils which in its first and most widely copied version (without the above story) was written probably at the end of the ninth century.⁸²³

There is also a most significant historical event which eloquently suggest that the Byzantines were accustomed to perceive and express the confrontation of good and evil through the ultimate conflict of Christ with death. This is the reported litany led by Patriarch Sergios as he and the people of Constantinople went in procession around the walls of the beleaguered capital on 29 July 626, pleading for salvation from the enemy’s attack. Having brought the Holy Robe of the Virgin, the relics of the True Cross, and the *acheiropoietos* icon of Christ, the patriarch and the faithful petitioned the Lord by singing Psalm 67:2-3: “Arise, O God, and let your enemies disperse. As smoke is driven away, so drive them away: as wax melteth before the fire, so let them perish at the presence of God.” Kartsonis observes that these verses were chosen for the occasion because they formulated a prayer asking Christ to repeat the miracle of his Resurrection. Since these verses were also chanted in the liturgical celebration of Easter Saturday in St Sophia in Constantinople, the people who participated annually in that feast and were present in the procession of 626 knew that the psalm spoke of Christ’s Resurrection. They were aware that by singing these

⁸²⁰ For the disputed identity of this writer and the date of his work see Kaldellis (1998), IX-XX.

⁸²¹ Genesios, *Regum libri quattuor*, ed. Lesmueller – Werner (1978), 56-57, book 4, §2; translated by Kaldellis (1998), 72-73.

⁸²² Ed. Duffy – Parker (1979), 196, (§156); see also Mango (1977), 133-34.

⁸²³ Ed. Duffy – Parker (1979); for the date see p. xiii and *ODB* III, 1994.

verses on the city walls they were imploring Jesus to rise and trample underfoot the barbarians threatening “his city” as he had trampled on Hades during his Resurrection. At the same time they were asking him to save the empire, as he had saved Adam and Eve from the realm of the underworld.⁸²⁴ There are obvious analogies here with the assimilation of iconophile victory over iconoclasm to the resurrection of the Orthodox Church from the death of heresy.

Based on the above evidence, one may justifiably assume that the scene of the Anastasis of Holy Zion on folio 100v of the Chludov Psalter was both conceived and promptly recognized as symbolic of the iconophile victory over iconoclastic heresy by the militant supporters of icons who created and used the manuscript in the ninth century. The commentaries of Eusebios and Didymos on Psalm 101:14 support this interpretation. Both writers see the “rebuilding of Zion”, implied in verse 14 and mentioned in verse 17, as a reference to the “renewal of the pious way of life”, which could be identified with the reinstatement of Orthodoxy in the Christian Church.⁸²⁵

What is the meaning, though, of the two black birds in the Chludov miniature, flying away from the scene of the Anastasis? They correspond to the night-crow mentioned in verse 7, and add a further element to the picture. In patristic literature, including iconophile texts, night and darkness are synonymous with all that is sinful, impious and heretic – in contrast to light which represents virtue, purity, truth and orthodoxy.⁸²⁶ These wild black birds of the night departing from the scene of the

⁸²⁴ Kartsonis (1998), 66-7. I am grateful to Professor Kartsonis for drawing my attention to this evidence. Another case where Christ’s Resurrection is paralleled to the deliverance from danger is found in an Easter homily by Epiphanius of Cyprus, *In sanctam Christi resurrectionem*, PG 43, 473B-476A. Epiphanius writes “O Lord arisen in three days from the dead, raise from the enemies your faithful people... You who raised Adam from the dead, raise the horn of the Christians... You who said ‘Greetings’ (to the Myrophores after the Resurrection, *Matthew* 28:9), say it now to your Church... Save your people. ‘Awake, wherefore sleepest thou’, why do you spare the enemies, ‘wherefore turnest thou thy face away’ (Psalm 43:23-24)? Rise!” Cf. Cutler (1992), esp. 55-57, commenting on the occasional use of *Ezekiel* 37:1-14 – a prophesy concerning Christ’s Resurrection according to patristic exegesis – as a metaphorical reference to the deliverance of the Byzantine empire or the positive development of personal affairs in Byzantine literature and art.

⁸²⁵ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 1237CD; *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), 223-24, (§969); also John Chrysostom, *In psalmos (spuria)*, PG 55, 638 (identical to the comment by Didymos).

⁸²⁶ (Cf. *Ephesians* 6:12, “For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms.”) For the distinction between divine light and the devil’s darkness in Byzantine theology in general see Perl (1998), 46 ff. As John of Damascus says in his *Expositio fidei*, ed. Kotter (1973), 49 (18, II.4:11-12), “Virtue is spiritual light, and likewise vice is spiritual darkness”. For the connection between iconoclasts and darkness, night, etc. in iconophile sources see, for example, Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* XII, 1018E, 1087B, *Mansi* XIII, 409E, 413A; Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 208B, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 601B-D, 605AB, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 127 (§76:3-4), 133 (§78:15-16), 289 (§182:13-16), 306 (§192:33-34); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 426 (epistle 286:26), 441 (301:60), 466 (323:29), 473 (332:22-24), 564/565

Resurrection could then represent the dark souls of the iconoclasts driven from the resurrected Orthodox Church by the light of the true faith. There is some similarity here with the exorcism of demons on folio 65r, which was analysed earlier as an allusion to the expulsion of the iconoclasts from the Church.

Indeed, in the literary tradition of Byzantium the night-crow symbolizes the devil or demons,⁸²⁷ an interpretation related to the evilness of Noah's raven (*Genesis* 8:6-7) and therefore to crows generally as symbols of vice, sin, wickedness, the devil, etc.⁸²⁸ In exorcism prayers and in narrations concerning men possessed by or freed from demons the evil spirits are often described as crows.⁸²⁹ Heretics are also called night-crows, for example in a homily by Leontios presbyter of Constantinople.⁸³⁰ In the life of the iconophile martyr Stephen the Younger, a "night-crow demon" informs the iconoclast Emperor Constantine V about the state of the imprisoned saint.⁸³¹ In the psalm commentary of Pseudo-Athanasios, the night-crow of Psalm 101:7 is interpreted as a symbol of the soul lying in the darkness of sin,⁸³² and Eusebios sees it as the darkness that falls upon those ignorant of God;⁸³³ Athanasios gives a similar interpretation.⁸³⁴ Such comments corroborate the identification of the night-crows in the Chludov miniature with fleeing iconoclasts who avoid the light of Orthodoxy, icon veneration, and thus the knowledge of God. This interpretation recalls in particular a passage from the *Refutatio et eversio* by Patriarch Nikephoros, where iconoclasts are said to be like bats, escaping from the light of truth, and resorting to their familiar darkness of falsehood.⁸³⁵

If the above analysis is correct, the representation of Christ raising the Church from the grave of heresy on folio 100v of the Chludov Psalter is a particularly

(407:7/24), 567 (408:7-8/13-14), 621 (441:23), 677 (471:41-43), 753 (507:5), 795 (531:25-26), 811 (538:11); *Vita Methodii*, PG 100, 1253D; *Vita Ignatii*, PG 105, 497B. See also Koutrakou (1999), 112-14, with more textual references.

⁸²⁷ For textual references see *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), note 423 (p. 268); Provatakis (1980), 249, n. 401; Lampe (1961), 927, "νυκτικόραξ".

⁸²⁸ See Leclercque, 'Corbeau', *DACL* III, 2 (1948), 2912-13; also Gutmann (1977). Some patristic references: Didymos, *In psalmos* (PG 39), ed. Mühlenberg (1975-78), 357:2-6 (§1273, Psalm 146:8-9); Leontios presbyter, *Homilies*, ed. Datema – Allen (1987), 266 (homily VIII:239; trans. Allen [1991], 110 [§15]); *Vita Theodori Studitae*, PG 99, 265B (the black raven, the devil, could not stand the virtue of Theodore the Studite); Patriarch Photios, *Epistulae*, ed. Laourdas – Westerink (1983-85), II, 120 (epistle 215), *Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink (1986-88), VI, 138 (question 329:10-12).

⁸²⁹ Provatakis (1980), 249-50, notes 403-405.

⁸³⁰ *Homilies*, ed. Datema – Allen (1987), 274 (homily IX:29; trans. Allen [1991], 114 [§3]).

⁸³¹ *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 168:23-4 (§68).

⁸³² *De titulis psalmorum*, PG 27, 1080C.

⁸³³ *In psalmos*, PG 23, 1256B.

⁸³⁴ *In psalmos*, PG 27, 428A.

⁸³⁵ Ed. Featherstone (1997), 78 (§36:6-10).

eloquent and effective iconographic solution, with strong anti-heretic allusions, and it is this specificity, rather than its supposedly “unsuccessful” character according to Grabar’s interpretation, that may be the reason for its rare appearance. Appropriate for a very particular polemical context, it is found only in the Chludov Psalter and its eleventh-century derivatives, the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters, whose illustrations are also characterized by a pronounced iconophile overtone.

Other miniatures of the Anastasis included in the Chludov Psalter, which follow the standard Byzantine iconography of the scene more closely, can also be seen as references to the defeat of iconoclasm and the triumph of Orthodoxy. Folio 63r (fig. 191), illustrating Psalm 67:2-3 (“Arise, O God, and let your enemies disperse”), has a good case in point.⁸³⁶ To one side of the defeated Hades a group of black demons, inscribed “God’s enemies”, are fleeing from Christ as he is raising Adam and Eve from the dead. The escaping demons correspond to the wording of the psalm (“let your enemies disperse”), but they may also be seen as representing the defeat of the demonic instigators of iconoclasm, or the expulsion of the heretic iconoclasts from the resurrected Orthodox Church (similar to the night-crows on folio 100v, or the demons departing from the Gerasene on folio 65r). This interpretation agrees with the identification of iconoclasts with demons or demoniacs, both in iconophile literature and in other miniatures of the Chludov Psalter already referred to. It is also worth remembering that the miniature under examination (folio 63r) illustrates the same psalm (67:2-3) as was chanted by Patriarch Sergios and the people of Constantinople on 29 July 626 petitioning Christ to rise and save his flock from the infidel barbarians. It is logical to suppose that these verses were used by the Byzantines as a plea for help against any evil threat, be it enemies of the empire, or iconoclasts as enemies of the faith.

The huge and monstrous figure of the vanquished Hades, who dominates the composition, is also an element that might have been meant to refer to the defeat of iconoclasm. The pronounced grotesqueness of this figure is an iconographic feature found only in representations of the Anastasis in the ninth-century marginal psalters and their eleventh-century copies.⁸³⁷ All other surviving Byzantine artefacts showing

⁸³⁶ No correlation should be suggested between the miniatures of folio 63r (fig. 191) and folio 62v (fig. 42), although this might seem inviting at first sight. The two pages originally were not facing each other, since another folio that is now missing was standing between them (Corrigan [1992], 143, the Chludov Psalter is lacking Psalms 65:5-66:1).

⁸³⁷ Kartsonis (1986), 139-40.

Hades in the scene of the Anastasis give him an old, completely human body, similar to or smaller in size than all the other participants of the scene, his most pejorative characteristic being, at times, the black colour of his skin (fig. 192).⁸³⁸ The extremely negative representation of Hades in the ninth-century marginal psalters is symptomatic of a polemic aggressiveness and hostility towards this figure, which can be explained as a reference to the heinous and death-like heresy of iconoclasm, defeated with God's help in order to bring back to the light of Orthodox life all humanity, represented in the miniatures by the resurrected Adam and Eve. Such an interpretation is in accordance with the iconophile mentality that assimilates iconoclasm and its supporters to death. Indeed, in one occasion Patriarch Nikephoros calls the iconoclasts after Hades himself, using a rhetorical expression that is also employed in other Byzantine anti-heretic texts: he says about them "What kind of Hades has uttered these (impious words)?"⁸³⁹ The monstrous figure of Hades in the ninth-century marginal psalters, of which folio 63r of the Chludov Psalter is a very characteristic example, may easily be regarded as the visual equivalent of the equally monstrous and grotesque profile of the iconoclasts as drawn by the verbal characterizations frequently used for them in iconophile literature.⁸⁴⁰ Of course, the above suggestion is only one potential explanation for the extreme visual hostility towards Hades in the ninth-century marginal psalters. Some other possible reasons have been mentioned in p. 211 above.

⁸³⁸ For some examples of such "human-like" representations of Hades see Kartsonis (1986), figs 14a-b, 24g, 26b, 57, 58, 60, 62, 67, 70, 85.

⁸³⁹ "Ποῖος Ἄιδης ταῦτα ἐφθέγγατο;": *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 305 (§192:7). Similar rhetoric questions concerning heretics are found, for example, in the Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi* VI, 965E; Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Panarion*, PG 645B; Patriarch Photios, *Biblioteca*, ed. Henry (1959-77), IV, 132:5-6, 159:10-160:11.

⁸⁴⁰ One of the most characteristic passages is found in Patriarch Nikephoros' *Antirrheticus I*, PG 100, 296CD, where the iconoclast emperor Constantine V is described as having a "feeble mind" and a "fat belly" and living in his own vomit and excrements (cf. also the nickname of Constantine V in iconophile texts: "Κοπρώνυμος"). Iconoclasts are described in similar hideous terms in Nikephoros' *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 83 (§37:57-60). Iconophiles often cite *Proverbia* 26:11, "As when a dog goes to his own vomit...", and *II.Peter* 2:22, "A dog returns to its vomit and a sow that is washed goes back to her wallowing in the mud", to describe iconoclasts that insist on their heretic ideas. Examples in: Patriarch Nikephoros, *Refutatio et eversio*, ed. Featherstone (1997), 9 (§5:17), 107 (§66:19-20), 133 (§78:1-2), 257 (§160:15-16); Theodore the Studite, *Epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (1992), 120 (epistle 40:164-65); *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 148:5-6 (§47). Iconoclasts are frequently accused by iconophiles of gluttony and obesity, e.g. in Patriarch Nikephoros' *Antirrheticus III*, PG 100, 488C, *Apologeticus*, PG 100, 545A; *Life of Stephen the Younger*, ed. Auzépy (1997), 126:7 (§28), 168:6 (§66). This reminds us of the obese figure of Hades in the ninth-century marginal psalters, a feature that has been also related to Hades' description in Byzantine homilies and hymns (Kartsonis [1986], 140).

Christ's Resurrection in the ninth-century marginal psalters appears in numerous variations of three basic types (Christ rising from the Tomb, Anastasis, Myrophores), only some of which have been examined here in detail. This iconographic plurality has been explained by scholars in various ways. For example, it has been seen as a result of random choices, indicating the miniaturists' restricted familiarity with traditional iconography "following roughly 120 years of off-and-on Iconoclasm", and their limited interest in particular iconographic details.⁸⁴¹ On the contrary, the analysis set out in this chapter has proposed that iconographic details and variations (such as type A and type B of Christ's Tomb, the Anastasis of Holy Zion, or the monstrous figure of Hades) were carefully chosen to convey specific theological and typological messages related to not only the iconophile cause, but also to major values of the Orthodox Church. The iconographic and compositional particularities of the miracle scenes examined in the first section of the chapter having been approached from the same point of view, the function of the miniatures as sophisticated visual exegeses of the text they illustrate is clearly attested.

The iconographic diversity of the Resurrection scenes in ninth-century marginal psalters has been explained as a result of intense iconophile experimentation, aimed at manifesting "the Orthodox obligation to portray all phases of the Incarnation as confirming its material reality".⁸⁴² This special interest has been considered the reason why certain iconographic types, like Christ rising from the Tomb, are not to be found outside these polemically iconophile codices – the prevalent iconographic type of the Resurrection in Byzantine art being the Anastasis.⁸⁴³ As we have seen, however, the representation of Christ's bodily rising from the Tomb is a relatively uncontroversial rendering of the events of Easter in iconophile thinking. On the contrary the Anastasis, showing Christ's human soul descending to Hades, is a more theologically radical scene, since some iconophiles did dispute that the human soul

⁸⁴¹ Brubaker (1989a), 44. Later Brubaker has adopted a different approach, also followed in this thesis. She talks about "single-instance" iconographic adjustments in the miniatures of ninth-century Byzantine codices (with specific reference to the marginal psalters, cod. Vat. gr. 699, and cod. Paris. gr. 510), employed "to make precise and time-specific points, tailored to a particular audience" and "to reinterpret the text to reaffirm the beliefs of their creators" (Brubaker [1999], 42).

⁸⁴² Kartsonis (1986), 131-32, 134, 137-38.

⁸⁴³ Kartsonis (1986), 138, 141.

could be visually represented. It follows that the reason for the popularity of the Anastasis in Byzantine art is not because it was a neutral image – it was far from that.

It has been also suggested that the depiction of Christ's rising from the Tomb and of the Anastasis in many variations indicates that both iconographic types were new and not yet crystallized in a standard format by the time they were depicted in the ninth-century marginal psalters.⁸⁴⁴ This is a possibility, but another factor should be also taken into consideration: the potential intention of those who made the codices to avoid excessive repetition in scenes that are frequently depicted in the same codex. For example, the scenes of Christ's Baptism and Ascension, the iconography of which was not a newcomer in Byzantine art, also present considerable iconographic variations from one miniature to the other within the same codex (figs 193-98).⁸⁴⁵

I suggest that the iconographic variations of the Resurrection in the ninth-century marginal psalters points indeed to experimentation. However, this was not due to lack of models or a wavering between conservatism and innovation, but a result of the intention to visualize specific arguments of iconophile polemics that in some cases were particularly relevant to this and no other production.⁸⁴⁶ This specificity (rather than a hypothetical iconophile aggressiveness) may explain why scenes like Christ raising Holy Zion, or emerging from his Tomb, appear only in the ninth-century marginal psalters for which they might have been created, and in their later derivatives. This hypothesis seems particularly apt for the iconography of Christ rising from the Tomb, which has been shown to have many links with the iconophile literature of the eighth and ninth century.⁸⁴⁷ This scene focuses on the precise historical moment of Christ's exodus from the grave, and the pictorial emphasis on the time and place of the burial makes the iconography especially appropriate for a polemical theological program. On the other hand, through the triumph of Jesus over death and the liberation of the Just from Hades, the scene of the Anastasis symbolizes the salvation of mankind beyond time and space, in the life of all Christians who in

⁸⁴⁴ Kartsonis (1986), 131-32, 136-37.

⁸⁴⁵ Compare the Ascension scenes on folios 14r, 22r, 46v, 55v of the Chludov Psalter (figs 193-96), and the Baptism scenes on 72v, 75v, 117r folios (figs 66, 197-98). The variations of these miniatures can not be explained only as a response to the differences of the psalm verses they illustrate.

⁸⁴⁶ Cf. Brubaker (1999), 42-43.

⁸⁴⁷ Kartsonis (1986), 40 ff., 52-57, 68-69, 227-36 has studied a similar case of theological disputes promoting, and being promoted by, a new iconography related to episodes in Christ's life. She has argued that it was the need to fight against Monophysites, Theopaschites, and Monothelites in the seventh century that seems to have led to the creation of the iconography of Christ's death on the Cross, and probably also of the Entombment and the Anastasis, used to illustrate a relevant polemical text by Anastasios of Sinai, known as *Hodegos (Viae Dux)*.

the figures of Adam and Eve recognize their past, present, and future. One reason, therefore, for the use of the Anastasis as the prevalent iconographic type for Christ's Resurrection in Byzantium may have been the timeless spiritual significance of the scene, which place it beyond any ongoing theological disputes.⁸⁴⁸

The analysis in this chapter has suggested that the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters was shaped to a large extent by the iconophile beliefs of their producers and by their concern about the defence of Orthodoxy in general. In the next chapter the influence of the liturgy will be examined as another factor contributing to the sophistication and complexity of references in these codices.

⁸⁴⁸ For the salvational symbolism of the Anastasis see, for example, Grabar (1936), 245; Grabar (1979-80), 125, 128, 134.

Chapter Four

Liturgy and the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters

This chapter will investigate the relation between the illustration in the ninth-century marginal psalters and the Byzantine liturgy. The Greek word *leitourgia* refers exclusively to the daily mass, the Eucharist, but the term *liturgy* will be used here to refer to any regular church service.⁸⁴⁹

The psalter played a major role in the Byzantine liturgy,⁸⁵⁰ and determined the structure of the liturgical rite more than any other sacred text.⁸⁵¹ Investigating the liturgical influence on psalter illustration is consequently very complicated, especially for the ninth-century psalters, whose miniatures demonstrate such an outstanding complexity of references. The relationship between these miniatures and the liturgy has been discussed in different ways in the literature. Almost a century ago Tikkanen was the first to recognize that most of the Christological and Mariological episodes shown in the Byzantine marginal psalters illustrate psalm verses that were chanted on the relevant feast days, and he saw this as indicative of extensive liturgical influence on the illustration of the codices. He noted that some of these verses were also quoted in the New Testament and/or in patristic commentaries as prophecies of the same Christological and Mariological episodes, but did not systematize his findings to determine which of the above factors, liturgical or biblical/patristic influence, was more decisive for the choice of illustration in the marginal psalters.⁸⁵²

In 1986 Walter attempted to answer this question by composing an exhaustive inventory of the Christological miniatures in these manuscripts. He examined 80 Christological episodes and grouped them in five categories according to the sources

⁸⁴⁹ See Patterson-Ševčenko (1998), 195 on this question.

⁸⁵⁰ Galavaris (1973), 20, 22-23.

⁸⁵¹ Strunk (1955-56), 181.

⁸⁵² Tikkanen (1903), 49 ff.

of influence that he identified.⁸⁵³ He concluded that only 12 were inspired by the liturgy – meaning that the corresponding psalm verse is used in the rite of the relevant feast day.⁸⁵⁴ His categorization is, however, somewhat misleading, for many of the 49 themes he considers inspired by the interpretation of the relevant verse in the New Testament or in psalm commentaries also illustrate verses used on feast days (cf. Tables 6, 8, 10, 12).⁸⁵⁵ This means that the influence of liturgical practice on the miniatures may be interpreted as far more extensive than Walter concluded, and closer to Tikkanen’s evaluation.

This is in fact the opinion that had been put forward by Cutler, in an article claiming that the bulk of the iconography in Byzantine marginal psalters has liturgical origins and associations that “would have been immediately evident and perfectly comprehensible to the contemporary user of the psalters but today requires explication”.⁸⁵⁶ Cutler identifies different levels of liturgical influence on the illustrations of these codices, not all equally evident, and gives a few examples aiming to demonstrate the overall complexity of the manuscripts.⁸⁵⁷ However, the number of scenes examined is much too small to support his thesis for the entire corpus of miniatures in the Byzantine marginal psalters, as Cutler himself admits. It is nevertheless useful for indicating both the extent of the problem and the sophistication vis-à-vis the liturgy in the illustration of these codices.

Many of Cutler’s examples concern miniatures in eleventh-century marginal psalters, where liturgical influence has been more extensively recognized than for their ninth-century counterparts.⁸⁵⁸ In her monograph on the illustration of the earlier psalters, Corrigan focuses on the issue of visual polemics, and the influence of the liturgy is not a main theme of her analysis. Although she recognizes that the choice of subject matter (and certain iconographic details) of the miniatures were conditioned to some extent by liturgical practice, she contends that the principal factor determining theme and iconography, especially in those images that were added in the ninth-century to the pre-existing tradition of psalter illustration, was the intention to create a

⁸⁵³ Walter (1986), 272-82, (and 284-86 for five more subjects in the eleventh-century marginal psalters).

⁸⁵⁴ Walter (1986), 277-79.

⁸⁵⁵ Walter (1986), 272-75.

⁸⁵⁶ Cutler (1980-81), 19.

⁸⁵⁷ Cutler (1980-81), 18 ff.

⁸⁵⁸ Cutler (1980-81), 22 ff.; Mariès (1950), 162. See also Barber (2000), 10-12.

visual statement in defence of Orthodoxy with a particular iconophile overtone.⁸⁵⁹ My own MA dissertation gave a few examples to suggest that Corrigan's iconophile emphasis has sometimes led to an undervaluation of the liturgical factor and its interplay with the polemical aspect of the illustration, without questioning however that the driving force in the creation of these codices was indeed the defence of Orthodoxy and especially of icon veneration as Corrigan has suggested.⁸⁶⁰

The aim of the present chapter will be to clarify how extensive and decisive is the influence of the liturgy on the illustration of the ninth-century psalters, with the intention of handling the issue in a more systematic and conclusive way than has so far been done in the literature. Groups of miniatures with the same Christological subject will be examined in order to determine whether the illustration of the relevant psalm verses depended more on their function in the liturgy or on their interpretation in patristic commentaries. The conclusions may offer a fresh perspective on the sources used and criteria applied by the makers of the psalters, and consequently on their ideological orientation and intentions.

The analysis focuses on Christological scenes, because Old Testament and literal miniatures are usually inspired directly by the psalm text they illustrate.⁸⁶¹ The Christological imagery, however, shows a different pattern, especially in miniatures depicting Christological events celebrated as major feasts in the Orthodox Church. The illustration of a psalm verse with an episode from Christ's life – in other words the exegesis of an Old Testament text with a New Testament episode – is the result of a process of interpretation that in most cases had been already applied to that specific verse before the creation of the ninth-century marginal psalters, either in psalm commentaries and other patristic texts, or in liturgical practice. Although Tikkanen's study emphasized the liturgical factor and Walter's the patristic one, in most cases it can be shown that the illustration of a certain verse with a specific Christological scene corresponds to the interpretation of that verse in *both* psalm commentaries and liturgical usage.⁸⁶² The highly informed ecclesiastical circles in which the ninth-century marginal psalters were produced will have been equally familiar with the psalter's patristic exegesis and its employment in the liturgy,⁸⁶³ but if one of the two

⁸⁵⁹ Corrigan (1992), 4-5, 41-42, 45-46, 56-59, 123.

⁸⁶⁰ Evangelatou (1998), 37-41.

⁸⁶¹ Corrigan (1992), 14-20.

⁸⁶² Same observation concerning the Theodore Psalter by Barber (2000), 11.

⁸⁶³ Corrigan (1992), 4, 110-11.

was more decisive in the choice of verses to be illustrated with a given Christological subject, its identification would be crucial for our understanding of the intentions and the criteria in the making of these codices.

How can this question be resolved? The method of investigation proposed in this chapter is to examine all the verses interpreted Christologically in the psalm commentaries used in Byzantium. It will be shown that most of these verses that were illustrated in the ninth-century marginal psalters were also used in relevant liturgical celebrations. Conversely most of the verses that were not illustrated in the psalters, although they were interpreted Christologically in the commentaries, were not mentioned in the relevant liturgical celebrations. In other words, absence of illustration usually coincides with absence of liturgical affiliations for a given psalm verse. This seems to indicate that the liturgical factor had precedence over the patristic one in the choice of the verses to be illustrated and the subject matter selected.

Such a methodological approach comes up against two major problems regarding sources. Concerning liturgical sources, I have employed the same texts as in previous research,⁸⁶⁴ particularly the *Typikon of the Great Church* (St Sophia at Constantinople) as preserved in cod. Hagiou Stavrou 40, dated mid-tenth century but believed to preserve an earlier tradition.⁸⁶⁵ A subsidiary source is the *Typikon* of the Greek Monastery of the Saviour at Messina, Italy, cod. Messinensis gr. 115, dated to 1131 and considered to closely follow the practice of the Studios monastery in Constantinople.⁸⁶⁶ In addition, both Tikkanen and Walter observed that certain psalm verses appear in hymns that were composed for specific feasts. This additional source can complement the information of the *Typikon of the Great Church*.⁸⁶⁷

The issue of commentary sources is particularly complicated. Not all psalm commentaries known in Byzantium have survived to the present day, nor are they easily available to us in the form they were then used. The extant psalm commentaries published in *PG* or in more recent editions present the interpretations of each commentator grouped together in the form of a continuous treatise; this was not the format presented to a ninth-century reader, when selections of psalm commentaries written by a number of different authors, the so-called *catenae*, were the norm. Most

⁸⁶⁴ Cf. Cutler (1980-81); Walter (1986).

⁸⁶⁵ Ed. Mateos (1962-63), I-II; for the date see vol. I, pp. XVIII-XIX.

⁸⁶⁶ *Typikon of the Monastery of the Saviour*, ed. Arranz (1969); p. XX for its dependence on the Studios tradition.

⁸⁶⁷ Tikkanen (1903), various examples, e.g. on pp. 49, 53, 60, 62, 63; Walter 278-79.

of today's editions of commentaries by individual authors derive from the *catena* manuscripts; but the full multiple-authored *catenae* remain unpublished. The matter is further complicated by the great number of different "types" of *catenae*, which vary considerable in length and in the number of authors whose texts are collected together.⁸⁶⁸

In other words, it is impossible to know how many Christological interpretations were included in the psalm commentaries available to the makers of the ninth-century marginal psalters – not to mention that some of these interpretations could have come from other patristic texts or their own intellectual activity. However, it seems safe for the purpose of the present investigation to use two of the most extensive *catena* manuscripts on the psalms that have survived: cod. Paris. gr. 146 of the tenth to eleventh century; and cod. Marc. gr. Z. 17, the well-known Psalter of Basil II, dated at the beginning of the eleventh century. According to Dorival, both these manuscripts are based on a Constantinopolitan compilation of psalm commentaries datable before 900 (but cod. Paris. gr. 146 has incorporated more sources).⁸⁶⁹ As these two manuscripts include in their commentaries a large number of Christological interpretations drawn from earlier compilations, one may assume that at least some of these commentaries were familiar to the producers of the ninth-century marginal psalters. The two *catena* codices can therefore give us an approximate idea of whether the Christological illustration of the ninth-century psalters seems to depend more on psalm commentaries or on liturgical usage. Some published psalm commentaries have also been taken into account, not only because at times they have Christological interpretations not included in the two *catena* manuscripts, but also because they show the broad range of sources used in the creation of *catenae* on the psalms, which may equally well have been used for the formation of the visual commentaries included in the marginal psalters.

Due to the bulk of information that the following investigation requires, a number of Tables are used to systematically present all the evidence, and the conclusions are summarized in the text. In these Tables the Christological scenes of the Theodore, Barberini, and Bristol Psalters are also taken into consideration, since

⁸⁶⁸ For all the above see Devreesse (1970); Mühlenberg (1975-78), III; Rondeau (1982); Dorival (1985); Dorival (1986-95). See also Corrigan (1992), 104-111 for the relation of the ninth-century marginal psalters with *catena* manuscripts.

⁸⁶⁹ Dorival (1986-95), IV, 360-61, 417-418. The *catena* of cod. Marc. gr. Z. 17 is very close to that of the famous cod. Paris. gr. 139 of the mid-tenth century (Dorival [1986-95], I, 247, IV, 418).

they offer some indication of the subjects that had probably been depicted in the ninth-century marginal psalters in relation to verses now missing from the codices. The Christological themes examined are those most frequently depicted in the psalters, and therefore most appropriate for statistical investigation.

Christ's Resurrection (Tables 5-6)

Christ's Resurrection is the most frequently applied Christological interpretation on the psalms in the surviving commentaries, and the most frequently represented episode in the ninth-century marginal psalters (in the versions of Christ rising from the Tomb, the Anastasis, the Myrophores, or David standing next to Christ's Sepulchre). If the conclusions from the analysis of this Christological theme point to a general pattern, the next step will be to see if it can be applied to other Christological subjects.

In all three ninth-century marginal psalters (including indications in the Theodore and Barberini Psalters for the missing folios), Christ's Resurrection is depicted for thirteen different verses in one or other of the iconographic versions mentioned above (Table 5). Ten of these verses have a direct liturgical affiliation (used in the relevant services, according to the *Typikon of the Great Church* – Table 5, numbers 1-3, 6-12), and two more have an at least indirect liturgical affiliation (being part of or similar to Easter hymns – Table 5, numbers 4, 13). However, only ten of these verses are related to the Resurrection in my commentary sources (Table 5, numbers 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11-13).⁸⁷⁰ These figures give a slight precedence to the liturgical over the exegetical factor as the motivation for the illustration of the ninth-century psalters, but this small difference in favour of a liturgical affiliation is only an indication and not a conclusive proof (for the preponderance of the liturgical factor). We shall have to examine all the psalm verses that were interpreted as prophecies on Christ's Resurrection in the commentaries but not illustrated as such in the psalters. To do so requires taking into consideration that all thirteen verses with a Resurrection miniature contain words easily related to this Christological event – such as “rise”,

⁸⁷⁰ Verse 24 of Psalm 43, which does not appear in psalm commentaries nor in the liturgy, is similar to verse 27 of the same psalm that is related to Christ's Resurrection both in psalm commentaries and in the liturgy (Table 5, numbers 5-6).

“stand up”, “save us”, “he broke the bronze gates” etc. Consequently, the wording of those psalm verses that were interpreted as prophecies of the Resurrection but are not accordingly illustrated is a factor that must be taken into consideration in the search for reasons that can explain the absence of such an illustration.

According to the published psalm commentaries and the *catena* manuscripts I have consulted, 56 psalms other than those already examined (and sometimes more than one verse in each psalm) are considered as prophetic references to Christ’s Resurrection (Table 6). I would like to suggest that the principal reason they were not chosen to be illustrated with a miniature of Christ’s Resurrection is that most of them were not used in the liturgical celebration of that event. Of the 56 psalms only nine were employed in services relevant to the Resurrection (mostly according to the *Typikon of the Great Church* – Table 6, numbers 2, 13, 25, 31, 44-46, 52-53), but just in three of them the wording could have inspired an illustration of Christ’s Resurrection (Table 6, numbers 2, 13, 53). It is worth noting that some of these psalms were illustrated in the marginal psalters with subjects inspired from the use of the text in other liturgical services, for which the vocabulary of the psalm verses can be considered more appropriate. For example, Psalm 23:7/10 (Table 6, number 13) was illustrated with Christ’s Ascension (see Table 11, number 2). Psalm 65:1 (Table 6, number 31) was illustrated on folio 62v in the Chludov Psalter with the episode of the Pentecost which, being the inauguration of the ecumenical Church of Christ, is a fitting visual commentary for the words “Shout unto God, all the earth”.⁸⁷¹ According to the *Typikon of the Great Church*, this psalm was sung as antiphonal in the week after Easter, when *Acts* 2 narrating the Pentecost was one of the main readings.⁸⁷² Similarly, although Psalm 117:24 was not illustrated with the Resurrection (Table 6, number 52), verse 26 of the same psalm was probably illustrated in the Chludov Psalter with the Entry into Jerusalem – the folio is missing,⁸⁷³ but such a scene appears on folios 157v and 202r of the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters respectively.⁸⁷⁴ Indeed, Psalm 117:26 was the *koinonikon* at the celebration of Palm Sunday according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*.⁸⁷⁵

⁸⁷¹ See p. 67 above.

⁸⁷² Ed. Mateos (1962-63), 98-104.

⁸⁷³ Corrigan (1992), 143.

⁸⁷⁴ Der Nersessian (1970), 53, fig. 255; Anderson – Canart – Walter (1989), 134.

⁸⁷⁵ Ed. Mateos (1962-63), 66. Psalm 117:26 was related to the Entry into Jerusalem already in *Matthew* 21:9 (Walter [1986], 272, number 12).

Returning to the list of psalms that were interpreted as prophetic of Christ's Resurrection (Table 6), of the remaining 47, for which no liturgical usage is reported in the *Typikon of the Great Church*, the wording of at least 31 would be more or less suitable for being illustrated with this Christological event. They refer to salvation from death or Hades, they ask the Lord to rise, stand up, save his people, or include the word "morning" which was consistently taken by psalm commentators to allude to the hour of the Resurrection.⁸⁷⁶ None of these 31 psalms being illustrated with the Resurrection makes it obvious that a relevant reference in psalm commentaries and an appropriate psalm vocabulary are not sufficient to inspire a Resurrection miniature. It seems that the decisive factor for illustrating a psalm verse with a specific Christological event is its use in the liturgy. Yet even this is not enough, the words of the verse must also be appropriate. Indeed, four psalms that according to the *Typikon of the Great Church* are employed in the liturgical celebration of the Resurrection but whose wording makes no obvious reference to this event, are not illustrated in the ninth-century marginal psalters.⁸⁷⁷

As we shall see, examination of the other major Christological events depicted in these psalters reinforces the conclusion that the selection of a psalm verse for being illustrated with the appropriate Christological scene depends largely (although not exclusively and not always) on its liturgical employment in the respective feast day *and* on the appropriateness of its wording.

Christ's Crucifixion (Tables 7-8)

The ninth-century marginal psalters depict the Cross or Christ's Crucifixion in nine compositions related to psalm verses that all have pertinent wording (Table 7, numbers 1-9; number 10 concerns a miniature that appears only in the eleventh-century marginal psalters). In the commentary sources I consulted, eight of these nine psalm verses are related to the Crucifixion (Table 7, numbers 2-9), and a liturgical

⁸⁷⁶ Table 6, numbers 3-5, 7-12, 14-15, 17-19, 22-24, 27, 34-35, 39-43, 48, 51, 54-55.

⁸⁷⁷ This is the case of Psalms 26:1a/1b/3 (at Vespers of Holy Saturday), 31:1/2 (after the baptismal rite on Holy Saturday), 76:14b-15a/11/12/15b (after Vespers on Sunday of Easter), and 32:22/1/3 (*prokeimena anastasima* – "of the Resurrection" – for the Liturgy); *Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos (1962-63), II, 84, 88, 96, 174.

affiliation can be attested for seven of them (Table 7, numbers 1-3, 5-6, 8-9). The iconographic details of the miniature illustrating Psalm 45:7 on folio 45v of the Chludov Psalter (Table 7, number 4, fig. 210) relate it also to a tradition concerning the life of Dionysios the Areopagite.⁸⁷⁸ This case reminds us that it was not only the liturgy and the psalm commentaries that influenced the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters, but other patristic sources as well.

In my commentary sources, 16 psalms other than those already mentioned (and sometimes more than one verse in each psalm) are linked to Christ's Passion on the Cross (Table 8). The wording of at least nine of these verses might have spurred an illustration, since it can be related to the contempt the Jews showed towards Christ when he was hanging on the Cross, to the earthquake that took place during the Crucifixion, the redemption brought to humanity through the Passion, etc.⁸⁷⁹ Nevertheless, not one of them is employed at the liturgical celebration of the Crucifixion (according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*) and, predictably in terms of our pattern of analysis, none is illustrated with a Crucifixion miniature in the ninth-century marginal psalters. Likewise, ten psalms used in the liturgy of Maundy Thursday and Good Friday (according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*) also remain unillustrated, since their wording is not appropriate to the Crucifixion.⁸⁸⁰

Christ's Baptism (Tables 9-10)

Christ's Baptism is depicted three times each in both the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalters, but the evidence of the Theodore and the Barberini Psalters suggests the existence of a fourth miniature illustrating Psalm 28:3, now missing (Table 9).⁸⁸¹ In the commentary sources I consulted all four psalms are related to Christ's Baptism. The wording of the text favours this exegesis, since it can be taken to refer either to the voice of God proclaiming Jesus to be his son after his immersion

⁸⁷⁸ Walter (1986), 275; Corrigan (1992), 83-85.

⁸⁷⁹ Table 8, numbers 2-4, 6-9, 12, 14, 16.

⁸⁸⁰ Psalms 82:19/2, 75:12/2, 139:2/3, 58:2/3, 2:2/12/3-4/5, 40:2/6/10-11, 69:2/3, 11:8/2/3, 140, 34:1/2/3 (*Typikon of the Great Church* ed. Mateos [1962-63], II, 72-74, 78-80).

⁸⁸¹ See p. 164, n. 579 above. Psalm 76:17 was illustrated in the Pantokrator Psalter with a scene that although does not represent Baptism, alludes to it: Christ is shown walking towards the personification of Jordan and another river (Dufrenne [1966], 28, pl. 13. The folio was cut from the psalter together with other three that are now kept in the Public Library of St Petersburg as cod. 265 – the relevant folio is 3v).

in the Jordan (*Matthew* 3:17, *Mark* 1:11, *Luke* 3:22 - *Psalm* 28:3), or yet to the defeat of the devil and his demons in the waters of Baptism (*Psalm* 73:13), or to the supernatural character of the event (*Psalms* 76:17, 113:5). All four psalm verses are also used in the liturgical celebration of the Christological event.

In my commentary sources, six other psalm verses are considered as prophetic references to Christ's Baptism (Table 10). None of them is employed in the celebration of the Epiphany (*Typikon of the Great Church*) and none is illustrated in the ninth-century marginal psalters, although in most cases the wording of the text could have motivated a miniature of Christ's Baptism. Other psalms used in the celebration of the Epiphany (*Typikon of the Great Church*) have texts not really germane to Christ's Baptism (general references to the glory of God, to the protection he offers to his people, or to the forgiveness of sins).⁸⁸²

Christ's Ascension (Tables 11-12)

This Christological episode is depicted four times in the Chludov Psalter, and my commentary sources interpret all four instances as prophetic references to the Ascension. The wording is fitting for such an exegesis, and all four verses are also used in the relevant liturgical celebration (Table 11, numbers 1-4; number 5 concerns a miniature that appears only in the eleventh-century marginal psalters).

The same commentary sources consider verses of eleven other psalms as prophetic references to the Ascension (Table 12), and in eight of these the wording could easily have suggested an illustration (Table 12, numbers 1-4, 7-10). Nevertheless, none of these verses being used in the liturgical celebration of the Ascension (at least according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*), none has an Ascension miniature in the ninth-century marginal psalters. The four antiphonal psalms that are indeed sung in the celebration of the Ascension (according to the *Typikon of the Great Church*) do not have a wording that can be directly related to the Christological event;⁸⁸³ accordingly, they are not illustrated in the ninth-century psalters.

⁸⁸² *Psalms* 140, 66:2-3/4-5/6-8, 92:1-2, 79:4/1, 26, 27, 44:2-3a/3bc/4-5a, 148:1, 31:1, 114, 117 (*Typikon of the Great Church*, ed. Mateos [1962-63], I, 176-86).

⁸⁸³ *Psalms* 85, 140, 41, 45 (ed. Mateos [1962-63], II, 126-28).

This evidence suggests that the liturgical employment of psalm verses during major feasts of the Orthodox Church and their appropriate vocabulary were basic criteria for selecting which verses to illustrate among the many interpreted Christologically in psalm commentaries. There are also a few cases of Christological miniatures that seem depended exclusively on liturgical inspiration and not on psalm commentaries.⁸⁸⁴ At the same time, there are certain Christological episodes, such as miracles or teaching scenes, that seem to have no liturgical affiliations but were inspired by the gospels, psalm commentaries or other patristic texts.⁸⁸⁵ The broad scope of sources employed in the selection of subject matter and even of certain iconographic details – a clear sign of the sophisticated cultural environment that produced the ninth-century marginal psalters – is a subject that would easily deserve another chapter on its own. The suggestion of the current investigation is that use of the psalter in the Byzantine liturgy has acted frequently and systematically as a guideline for the illustration of the codices in question, especially where major Christological episodes in the history of the Incarnation for the salvation of humankind are concerned.

There may have been a practical reason for this. The planners of the manuscript (most likely highly-ranking clergy), were certainly familiar with the rite of the Byzantine Church and were no doubt regular participants in it, and their consequent knowledge on the liturgical use of the psalter offered them an easily accessible source of inspiration for the Christological interpretation of this Old Testament book. But there may also have been ideological criteria. By drawing attention to those psalm verses that were used in the liturgical celebration of major Christological events, the illustration declares its exegetical validity on the basis of liturgical authority. Psalm commentaries were not as venerable, homogenous and indisputable sources of Christological exegesis as the liturgical employment of the psalms. Although respectful authors, the commentators did not always agree in their interpretations, and their work could be refuted, or even forged by the heretics.⁸⁸⁶ This

⁸⁸⁴ See Table 5, numbers 2, 10; Table 7, number 1; also Walter (1986), 278-79, nos. 63-65 for some more examples.

⁸⁸⁵ See Walter (1986), 272 (no. 6, cf. Eusebios, *In psalmos*, PG 23, 740-41), 273 (no. 9, cf. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *In psalmos*, PG 55, 761; nos. 20, 25), 274 (nos. 29, 34, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47), 275 (no. 50), 280 (no. 73, cf. Athanasios, *In psalmos*, PG 27, 312C).

⁸⁸⁶ For the problem of textual interpretation during the iconoclast crisis and its connection to ninth-century marginal psalter illustration see Corrigan (1992), 113-120.

was not the case with liturgical practice, the applied theology and living tradition of the Church, the sanctity of which could not be questioned by anyone. The illustration of psalm verses that by their vocabulary and liturgical affiliations appear as indisputably valid Christological prophecies places particular emphasis on a basic iconophile claim, already mentioned earlier: that since Christ's Incarnation was foretold in the Old Testament, fulfilled in the New Testament and regularly celebrated in the liturgy, it should be also made visible in images.⁸⁸⁷

This argument is quite openly emphasized in a few miniatures with eucharistic subject matter.⁸⁸⁸ Moreover, there are a few compositions in the Chludov Psalter that seem to base their polemical message on not only iconophile but also liturgical inspiration.⁸⁸⁹ It appears, therefore, that the liturgical influence on the illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters can be also considered polemically iconophile, both in its extensive and systematic presence and in its conceptual function. This is in accordance with the idea that the Byzantine liturgy was polemically militant in defence of Orthodoxy (although in panegyric rather than contesting manner), by gradually incorporating the dogmatic beliefs and concerns of the Church until they were everyday experiences of the congregation through the words, images, objects, movements and the whole mystagogy of the event.⁸⁹⁰ The illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters is another expression of this theology, also built on many layers of meaning.

⁸⁸⁷ See pp. 40, 50-51, 120, 184-85, n. 685 above.

⁸⁸⁸ Such as the Communion of the Apostles illustrating Psalms 33:9 and 109:4 (or David and Melchisedek flanking a circular icon of Christ instead of the Communion), discussed by Corrigan (1992), 55-59.

⁸⁸⁹ Evangelatou (1998), 37-41; see also pp. 67-71 above.

⁸⁹⁰ For the issue of liturgy as theology see, for example, Taft (1997), 233-38; Kartsonis (1986), 227, for a reference to the canons of the Council in Trullo (691-92) that emphasized the yearly and weekly liturgical commemoration of the Resurrection as response to various heretic beliefs; Meyendorff (1984), 42 ff., esp. 48-52, interpreting the emphasis on Christ's Incarnation in the commentary on the Eucharist by Patriarch Germanos as response to heresy, and iconoclasm in particular.

Conclusions

The iconoclast controversy led the Byzantines to think and write about the use and validity of images to an extent unparalleled in any other period in their history.⁸⁹¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that close relationship of text and imagery in a range of illustrated manuscripts produced in the ninth-century after the iconophile victory of 843 reflects several aspects of the iconophile theory.⁸⁹² For example, the biblical and patristic authors who are frequently represented next to and often looking or pointing at passages of their writings compiled in cod. Paris. gr. 923 (a copy of the *Sacra Parallela*, probably produced in Constantinople) seem to be authenticating the authorship and accuracy of the texts, in accordance with iconophile ideas.⁸⁹³ Similarly, in cod. Paris. gr. 510 (a copy of homilies by Gregory Nazianzenus that Patriarch Photios presented as a gift to Basil I), miniatures of certain Old Testament visions and New Testament theophanies seem intended to emphasize the iconophile belief in the perception of the divinity through images.⁸⁹⁴

Only in the ninth-century marginal psalters, however, appear overtly polemical anti-iconoclastic illustrations and numerous representations of icons as objects included in the composition, so that their iconophile character is much more accentuated than in other ninth-century manuscripts. Not surprisingly, they draw widely on the arguments and motifs of iconophile literature, which generates a complex and sophisticated visual language. Although the present thesis has examined only a small number of miniatures from the corpus illustrating these psalters, it proposes a methodological approach that can be applied to other miniatures as well, and leads us to general observations concerning the manuscripts and the cultural environment that produced them. Some of these observations corroborate and develop conclusions by earlier writers, others offer new suggestions.

⁸⁹¹ Brubaker (1999), 26.

⁸⁹² Brubaker (1999), 25-26, 43-52.

⁸⁹³ Brubaker (1999), 25, 49-57, esp. 52 ff.

⁸⁹⁴ Brubaker (1999), 281-307.

Scholars have recognized that a number of ninth-century marginal-psalter miniatures act not only as illustrations but also as commentaries to the text.⁸⁹⁵ The New Testament miniatures comment on the prophetic aspect of the psalms. Certain Old Testament scenes give the historical references of the psalms an anti-Jewish slant. Many of the literal miniatures showing the punishment of impiety and reward of virtue emphasize the moral aspect of the text. Miniatures of all three categories, and of course compositions that praise iconophiles and condemn iconoclasts, reinterpret David's words in the light of a specific ninth-century interest in the defence of Orthodoxy and particularly icon veneration.

The suggestion put forward in the present thesis is that the visual commentary in these psalters is rather more extensive, sophisticated and iconophile-oriented than previously recognized. The subject matter, iconography, and compositional arrangement of many Old and New Testament miniatures can be related to theological arguments and/or rhetorical expressions common not only to specifically iconophile texts, but also to the broader tradition of patristic literature and Orthodox theology to which iconophile polemics belongs. This suggests that even miniatures that seem to derive their features purely from the wording of the psalm they illustrate and its patristic or liturgical exegesis, would carry a more complex message for the ninth-century clergy who planned and used the manuscripts. The texts employed in this research have made it possible to approach the mentality, interests, and patterns of expression that prevailed in the highest ranks of the iconophile party among whom the psalters in question were produced and circulated. These texts shared with the illustrations of the psalters the same cultural environment, which both of them defined and reproduced, formed and expressed – the one verbally, the other visually. Today the literary tradition of that time can help us understand what the Byzantines meant by and saw in the imagery of the ninth-century marginal psalters, not because these miniatures illustrate the texts, but because both images and literature illustrate their epoch.⁸⁹⁶

However, literary and visual expression in the Byzantine society was not only parallel but also interrelated. This is attested in the codices in question even by the format of marginal illustration, which is a clear indication of the close connection

⁸⁹⁵ Corrigan (1992) – e.g. 137-138; Brubaker (1999), 408-409.

⁸⁹⁶ Cf. Brubaker (1999), 58.

between text and image.⁸⁹⁷ But the miniatures of the ninth-century marginal psalter interact with not only the adjacent text of the psalms, but with a number of other texts and sources as well. Next to the regular influence of patristic and liturgical exegesis on the psalms (in other words the interpretation of the psalms according to specific commentaries and the use of the psalter in the liturgy), the miniatures at times demonstrate iconographic and compositional peculiarities that seem inspired by specific iconophile or other patristic texts, ranging from homilies and hymns to council acts, dogmatic discourses and saints' lives.

The sophistication of the cultural environment that produced these codices is obvious not only from the range of sources that are involved in the creation of their illustration, but also from the subtlety and eloquence of the visual language employed. Iconographic details and variations, compositional solutions and cross-references between miniatures of the same, facing or following pages on the basis of analogies or antitheses are extensively employed in order to enrich the message of both illustration and psalm text, and to emphasize particular concepts.⁸⁹⁸ These features demonstrate a high skill in the construction and comprehension of a complicated visual language, in accord with the important role of symbols and signs in Byzantine society.⁸⁹⁹

Indeed, the imagery of the ninth-century marginal psalters speaks not only of the elite cultural environment in which the manuscripts were produced and used, but also of underlying aspects of Byzantine culture generally. The visual reinterpretation of the psalms according to the interests of a specific ninth-century audience is in line with the rich literary tradition of tropological exegesis for the psalter in Byzantium. The use of the biblical past as a metaphor of contemporary life (the typological aspect of the miniatures) conforms to an idea that clearly dominated Byzantine culture: its belief in the Christian Church (and the Byzantine empire protecting it) as the New Israel. The prominent role of this idea not only in psalm commentaries, iconophile polemics and other patristic texts, but also in fundamental expressions of Byzantine society such as church and court ceremonial, indicates that the typological approach is basic to the interpretation of the ninth-century marginal psalters, products of the highest ecclesiastical circles of post-iconoclast Constantinople. Since this has been largely overlooked in previous studies of the codices, most of the miniatures chosen

⁸⁹⁷ For comments on the marginal format see Corrigan (1992), 104-111.

⁸⁹⁸ Corrigan (1992), 88, and esp. 112, mentioned a few examples of juxtaposed miniatures on the same, facing or following pages.

⁸⁹⁹ See p. 202, n. 755 above.

for analysis in this thesis aimed to support it with characteristic examples. Another feature of the ninth-century marginal psalters, and especially the Chludov Psalter, that has been emphasized in connection with the typological aspect of the miniatures, is the importance of the conflict of good and evil, a thought pattern prominent in both the Byzantine world-view and the psalms themselves. In the marginal psalters, the biblical versions of this conflict – ranging from the Old Testament battle for life between David and wild beasts or Goliath, to the New Testament confrontation of Christ with demons, tempests and sin – remind us of the intensity of the iconophile-iconoclast controversy which ranged from life-threatening persecutions to the more controlled aggressiveness of oral debates or polemical treatises.⁹⁰⁰

Another aspect of ninth-century marginal-psalter illustration that results from the exegetical function of the miniatures is that in certain cases the visual text has a multiplicity of references and so self-contained a character that it can stand independently of the psalm text it accompanies. Certainly, such autonomy of the imagery is more evident in full-page rather than marginal miniatures, a characteristic example being the prominently exegetical illustrations in cod. Paris. gr. 510.⁹⁰¹ However, the ninth-century marginal psalters contain instances where the correlation of miniatures on the same or facing folios, not only by antithesis or analogy, but at times also through the conceptual relation of their subjects, has resulted in a number of compositions with specific polemical significance that their ninth-century audience would be able to perceive even independently of the psalm text. Most of these compositions are found in the Chludov Psalter, for example on folios 23v-24r, 62v, 65r, 78v-79r, 109v-110r, 147v-148r (figs 20-21, 42, 106, 99-100, 88-89, 22-23); another such instance has survived on folios 17v-18r of the Paris marginal Psalter (figs 90-91). This allows us to suppose that at least the Chludov Psalter may have been used not only to read the psalms and meditate on their message as recontextualized by the miniatures, but at times even for browsing through the visual text of the images alone, or to pass from the images to the text rather than the other

⁹⁰⁰ Other examples of visual confrontation in the ninth-century marginal psalters are mentioned by Corrigan (1992), 111-13; see also 120-123, esp. 122.

⁹⁰¹ Brubaker (1999), 411.

way round.⁹⁰² The clergy's familiarity with the psalter, which they would know by heart,⁹⁰³ will have made it easy for the eye to wander among the miniatures.

The extensive use of reference marks in the Chludov Psalter (see Appendix, pp. 246-256) also facilitates independent meditation on the miniatures since it ties them to specific psalm verses and enables the viewer not only to pass from the text to the image but from the image to the text as well. Reference marks support the exegetical nature of the imagery and enhance the reader's agility in deciding how to move through the manuscript, just as the marginal format does: the numerous miniatures scattered throughout the psalter act as a kind of reference for the reader to follow various paths in the use of the codex, according to his interests. By using the miniatures as guidelines in his contemplation, he can identify psalms that prophesy major Christological events; foretell the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New; refer to punishment of the wicked and reward of the virtuous; witness the persecution of the just in the name of the Lord; celebrate the victory of good over evil; offer eloquent phrases to condemn the sinful and blasphemous and praise the pious and righteous; teach charity and repentance; exhort to study of the scriptures and other major Christian virtues, etc. etc.

The illustration of the ninth-century marginal psalters is polemical not only for its content, therefore, but also for its function as an index to psalm verses that can be used for polemic purposes against heresy and sin, whether in an oral debate or a sermon, either in a dogmatic treatise or other theological text. The many layers of meaning frequently incorporated in the miniatures as well as the marginal format allow the beholder of the ninth-century marginal psalters various choices in the use of the codices and the interpretation of the illustration – in other words, to have a creative and interactive role in the viewing of the miniatures, which is congruent with iconophile ideas on the great importance of the beholder's share in the contemplation of images.⁹⁰⁴

General observations on the three ninth-century marginal psalters aside, it is evident that each has its own character and deserves individual comments. The fragmentary state of the Paris marginal Psalter does not allow us to say much. However, the illustration of Psalm 105 on folios 17v-18r (figs 90-91) with pairs of

⁹⁰² Cf. similar comments concerning the Theodore Psalter by Barber (2000), 9, 14, 18; Barber (2000a), 14.

⁹⁰³ Corrigan (1992), 4.

⁹⁰⁴ Brubaker (1999), 28-29.

miniatures in balanced compositions, characterized by eloquent analogies and antitheses, as well as iconographic peculiarities, closely resembles the relevant illustrations in the Chludov Psalter (folios 109v-110r, figs 88-89), and indicates the high sophistication of visual language that must have been used in many of the lost miniatures as well.

A comparison between the Chludov and the Pantokrator Psalter leads to some significant observations. The Pantokrator Psalter has a smaller number of overtly polemical anti-iconoclast miniatures. It omits the miniatures which in the Chludov Psalter condemn John the Grammarian and anonymous iconoclasts in relation to Psalms 36:35, 51:9, 67:22, 68:29 (figs 1-4). It also omits miniatures which in the Chludov Psalter are part of compositions with complex iconophile references, such as the exorcism of the Gerasene related to Psalm 67:31 and the woman in haemorrhage related to Psalm 84:3 (compare figs 111-12, 117-18). Rare iconographic elements of iconophile significance, such as the ciborium-like Tomb of Christ and the Resurrection of Holy Zion illustrating Psalms 9:33 and 101:14 in the Chludov Psalter (figs 149, 187), do not appear in the Pantokrator Psalter which, on the other hand, includes iconographic solutions of profound iconophile connotations that are not found in the Chludov Psalter, such as the illustration of Psalms 109:4, and 113:12-16 (fig. 19).⁹⁰⁵ Some psalms in the Chludov Psalter illustrated by miniatures with strongly anti-iconoclast allusions – such as Psalm 88:10 (Christ rebuking the wind and sea, fig. 106), and Psalm 151 (David killing the lion, the bear, and Goliath, figs 22-23) – are missing from the Pantokrator Psalter, so we do not know if they were similarly illustrated. The Chludov Psalter's correlation of miniatures on the same or facing folios on the basis of analogies or antitheses that frequently construct a sophisticated visual text of iconophile allusions rarely appears in the Pantokrator Psalter. The only such case survives on folio 42v, illustrating Psalm 35 with the Samaritan woman acknowledging Christ as the Messiah, in juxtaposition to the Jews who deny and attempt to arrest him.⁹⁰⁶ It should be noted, however, that this lack of cross-references between miniatures is partly due to the fact that in the Pantokrator Psalter the psalm verses are written in shorter and more numerous lines than in the Chludov Psalter (e.g.

⁹⁰⁵ Corrigan (1992), 57-59, 33-35.

⁹⁰⁶ Corrigan (1992), 65-66; Brubaker (1999), 266-69.

compare figs 100, 103), so the entire text takes up more folios,⁹⁰⁷ and the miniatures of verses that in the Chludov Psalter appear on the same or facing folios are separated in the Pantokrator Psalter (e.g. in the illustration of Psalms 73, figs 66, 68-69; and 105, figs 88-89, 92).

Although the illustration of the Pantokrator Psalter has an obvious iconophile orientation and acts as an elaborate visual commentary, it is not as polemically iconophile nor as iconographically and compositionally sophisticated as the illustration of the Chludov Psalter. While the three ninth-century marginal psalters are creations of the same milieu and have many similarities, they also have individual characteristics. This is similar to the production of the *catena* manuscripts with commentaries on the psalms which, even when they follow a common model, are never identical but incorporate different elements according to the specific interests and preferences of their respective commissioners and producers.⁹⁰⁸

Of the three ninth-century marginal psalter in their present state of preservation, the Chludov Psalter has the most sophisticated and iconophile-oriented illustration. The frequent correlation between miniatures; the extensive use of compositional analogies and antitheses; the rare or unique iconographic solutions; the reference marks; the choice and treatment of subject matters that emphasize the conflict of good and evil, recast the past into a metaphor of contemporary life, or relate to theological arguments of iconophile polemics; all these elements result in an exegetical visual language of great complexity of references, comparable to another of the most sophisticatedly illustrated manuscripts of Byzantine art, cod. Paris. gr. 510.⁹⁰⁹ This does not mean, of course, that both of these manuscripts were necessarily produced in the same environment, and under the guidance of Patriarch Photios. For one thing, if Photios was involved in the production of the Chludov Psalter, we would expect that Patriarch Tarasios, who was his uncle and in charge of the first restoration of icons in 787,⁹¹⁰ or even Patriarch Methodios, in charge of the second restoration of icons in 843 and acquainted to Photios,⁹¹¹ would have been praised in the miniatures next to Patriarch Nikephoros. Scholars have collected substantial evidence for

⁹⁰⁷ Although the Pantokrator Psalter lacks more folios than the Chludov Psalter, it still has 226, as opposed to the 169 folios of the Chludov Psalter (Corrigan [1992], 140, 144).

⁹⁰⁸ Dorival (1986-95).

⁹⁰⁹ For cod. Paris. gr. 510 see Brubaker (1999), 408-11, 414-16.

⁹¹⁰ Mango (1977), 137.

⁹¹¹ The young Photios wrote a hymn that was recited at the funeral of Methodios in 847 (Mango [1977], 139).

attributing the ninth-century marginal psalters to the circle of Patriarch Methodios,⁹¹² and the intense anti-iconoclast character of their imagery supported in this thesis is one argument in point. The visual exegesis developed in the three psalters, and especially in the Chludov Psalter, indicates that although the sophisticated imagery of cod. Paris. gr. 510 remains unique, many basic characteristics of its elaborate visual language were already developed in other productions related to the high ranking ecclesiastical circles of Constantinople after 843. The driving force behind this development seems to have been the intense intellectual activity of the iconophiles in defence of icon veneration and Orthodoxy generally.⁹¹³

In the three ninth-century marginal psalters, and especially in the Chludov Psalter, the many layers of meaning that characterize the illustration demonstrate in practice the iconophile tenet that images are equal or even superior to words.⁹¹⁴ Indeed, in these psalters images work as exegetical texts of exceptional density. They are more than a pictorial supplement to written exegesis, as Brubaker suggests about them when she emphasizes the clearly exegetical function of the miniatures in cod. Paris. gr. 510.⁹¹⁵ Ninth-century marginal-psalter miniatures *are* visual exegesis, in fact they are the only exegesis that appears in the codices –the inscriptions that accompany the miniatures being complementary to them and not exegetical to the psalm text. Since visual exegesis is not mentioned in iconophile literature among the uses assigned to images, the illustration of these psalters, as well as of cod. Paris. gr. 510, indicate that after 843 the iconophiles elaborated and extended in practice ideas that during Iconoclasm they were able to express only in theory.⁹¹⁶ The multiplicity of references in the illustration of the ninth century marginal psalters testifies to the power of visual polemics they were finally able to use after more than a century of training in all other fields of confrontation. Following the triumph of Orthodoxy, icons were no longer at the centre of a dispute; they had become objects of veneration again. Yet they were also a weapon with which to justify, safeguard, and celebrate the victory that had been won in their name.

⁹¹² See p. 25, n. 5 above.

⁹¹³ Corrigan (1992), 135-39; Brubaker (1999), 26, 43-52.

⁹¹⁴ Corrigan (1992), 136; Brubaker (1999), 47 ff. See also p. 136, n. 462 above.

⁹¹⁵ Brubaker (1999), 416.

⁹¹⁶ Corrigan (1992), 137-38; Brubaker (1999), 43-45.

Appendix

The use of reference marks in the Chludov Psalter

The Chludov Psalter is the only one of the three surviving ninth-century marginal psalter in which the miniatures are systematically connected with the psalm verses they illustrate by the use of reference marks. Corrigan has compared these marks to the signs that in many *catena* manuscripts of the psalms connect the comments with the relevant psalm verses.⁹¹⁷ As mentioned in page 242 above, the marks in the Chludov Psalter emphasize the exegetical nature of the illustration, and significantly influence the way the codex can be used in meditation, by facilitating a reading from the text to the miniatures and *vice versa*. It is therefore important to determine whether these signs are original ninth-century elements, or added to the manuscripts in the twelfth/thirteenth century when the text was overwritten in minuscule and the miniatures may have been retouched.⁹¹⁸

After examining the manuscript in a short visit to the State Historical Museum in Moscow, in May 2000,⁹¹⁹ I have collected evidence suggesting that many of the reference marks are indeed original; moreover, the retouching of the miniatures may not be as extensive as has been thought. These two issues are correlated, since scholars tend to believe that wherever bright colours are used in the miniatures and for reference marks they were added in the twelfth/thirteenth-century repainting.⁹²⁰ As will be seen, this is not always the case.

Before giving specific examples, some preliminary observations will be helpful. Although they may derive from the material to be presented below, their

⁹¹⁷ Corrigan (1992), 109.

⁹¹⁸ Corrigan (1992), 143-44.

⁹¹⁹ I am most grateful to Dr Helena Serebriakova, Head of the Manuscript Department, and Tamara Hegoumnova, Deputy Director of the State Historical Museum, for allowing me to see the Chludov Psalter, and to Alexei Lidov for helping me get this permission.

⁹²⁰ Corrigan (1992), 143-44.

being mentioned here will make it easier for the reader to follow the analysis of the evidence.

The original text of the Chludov Psalter was written with sepia ink in upright uncial script.⁹²¹ The enlarged initials were written in the same ink, in the margin just to the left of the text. Then, when the miniatures were added, some initials of verses related to the illustrations were overwritten with the same colours as used in the miniatures (see numbers 11-32 below). During the twelfth/thirteenth-century rewriting of the text, almost all the initials were overwritten in red ink.⁹²² It is important to note that the original ninth-century pointed shape of the initial C, E and O () was then changed to a rounded shape that leaves visible the pointed edges of the original script ( , see for example figs 66, 106, 109, 191, 196, 230). Similarly, the ninth-century initial A with a diagonal right stroke () was replaced by an A with vertical right stroke ( , see for example figs 117, 149, 195). Only very rarely does the new scribe try to imitate the shape of the ninth-century initials (see for example figs 193, 229). It is logical to suppose that if the miniatures were retouched this was done after rewriting the text, so that the painted surface would not suffer any loss during the scribe's intervention, and the painter would be able to insert (or repaint) reference marks relating the images with the correct parts of the rewritten text (which is usually, but not always, exactly on top of the original script, cf. number 17 below). This leads to the conclusion that initials not overwritten in red ink but painted with a colour that appears also in the miniatures (numbers 29-32 below), must have been there before the other initials were overwritten in red, so they most probably are the ninth-century originals. In some cases, coloured initials of the characteristically pointed ninth-century shape are partly or entirely outlined, or overwritten, in the red ink of the twelfth/thirteenth-century phase (numbers 11-28), further supporting the hypothesis that coloured initials not overwritten belong to the ninth century. It is evident that these initials have the role of reference marks and their ninth-century origin demonstrates the interests of the psalter makers to connect text and image, either with initials or with reference marks some of which do seem to be of the ninth century (numbers 1-10).

⁹²¹ Corrigan (1992), 143.

⁹²² Corrigan (1992), 144, seems to suggest that the red initials are done by a hand later than the one rewriting the rest of the text, but this does not make much sense. For one thing, when the text was rewritten in dark ink, initials left in their original sepia would have looked faded by comparison. Secondly, the red of the rewritten initials is the same as the red of the rewritten titles, which were of the same hand as rewrote the text.

Original reference marks

Corrigan notes that while most reference marks are in the red ink or bright colours that she identifies with the rewriting and retouching of the twelfth/thirteenth century, in six cases they must be of the ninth century, because they are painted in the original colours of the miniatures, or the red ink of the original titles, or the sepia ink of the original inscriptions (and text).⁹²³ They are found on the following folios:

1. Folio 22v (fig. 199). Light blue, almost faded reference mark above the martyr.
2. Folio 23v (fig. 20). Purple-blue arrows above and next to Nikephoros (Psalm 25:5); purple-blue and red marks above the head of Symbatios Constantine, and above the word “ungodly” of Psalm 25:5; red arrows above Symbatios, and above the blood gushing from the wall on the right (Psalm 25:9).
3. Folio 30r (fig. 200). Pink drop-like reference mark next to the man sealing his mouth and adjacent to the relevant verse (Psalm 33:14). The man’s dress is of the same pink. The red arrows relating the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes to verse 9 may be painted or overpainted in the red ink of the rewritten initials (since the initial of verse 9 is linked to the arrow next to it).
4. Folio 30v (fig. 201). An undulating arrow below the reliquary and another sign to the left of the “Just” are in the light blue of the rays of light descending from the sky; a sign in the sepia ink of the inscription appears next to the head of the old monk in the background of the group of the “Just”.
5. Folio 14r (fig. 193). Two reference marks, above Christ’s head and next to Psalm 17:11, are painted in the sepia ink of the original text – and in red dots that could be twelfth/thirteenth-century additions (bright red ink similar to that of the rewritten initials).
6. Folio 65v (fig. 203). The two red reference marks above the three martyrs and the relevant word of Psalm 67:36 are not bright as the rewritten

⁹²³ Corrigan (1992), 143.

initials, but somehow faded like the original red inscriptions and liturgical rubrics.

To these I add the following:

7. Folio 10r (fig. 204). Two brown dotted reference marks (above the bird on top of the page and above the archer bottom left) resemble the sepia ink used for the original inscriptions and text, as well as the colour of the bird's feathers and the archer's bow that seem to be original.
8. Folio 31v (fig. 205). Two dark blue cross-like dotted reference mark appear above the figures of the false witnesses and above the relevant word of Psalm 34:11. Christ's garment and the cushion of the high priest's throne are in the same colour. Even if we suppose that they were overpainted (which is not necessarily the case), the gap in the second line of the original inscription to make space for the reference mark clearly indicates that there had always been such a sign in this place (either in the blue colour of the miniature, or in another colour, overpainted blue when the miniature was retouched).
9. Folio 32v (fig. 206). The dark blue reference marks that appear above Judas and above the word "iniquitous" of Psalm 35:1 are of the same dark-blue as Judas' garment. Since the original title of the psalm has a gap that divides the word ΤΕΛΟ(C) ("end") in two to make space for the reference mark, it seems that the mark is a ninth-century original too, likewise the dark blue of Judas' garment.
10. Folio 75v (figs 197, 207). Various green reference marks. The same colour is used for some of John and Jacob's garment folds at the bottom of the page. Since the twelfth/thirteenth-century red initial of Psalm 76:17 partly covers the green cross next to it, the sign must have been there before the initial was rewritten. Therefore it is probably original and ninth-century, and so are the other green reference marks.

Original coloured initials (and reference marks)

There are a number of painted initials that are clearly original since the twelfth/thirteenth-century red initials are painted over them.

11. Folio 13v (figs 208-209). Below (and partly covered by) the big red twelfth/thirteenth-century initial A of Psalm 17:1 the ninth-century initial is visible. It is written in the sepia ink of the original script and painted along its right diagonal side with the blue colour also used in the miniature (for David's dress, segment of sky, rays of light) and the decorative elements around the title, which were partly covered by the gold leaf added when the text and the title were rewritten.
12. Folio 30v (figs 201-202). The initial Φ of Psalm 33:21 illustrated with a reliquary, was painted in the ninth century in the same blue as used for the segment and rays of sky above the "Just" and the reference marks mentioned above (see number 4). The twelfth/thirteenth-century red initial is painted right on top of the blue one, but without covering it completely, especially in the curve on the lower left.
13. Folios 45v-46r (figs 210-13). The initials E and Π of Psalms 45:7 and 46:2 respectively (and two arrow-like reference marks next to them) were painted in the ninth century with the dark blue also used for various garments in the relevant miniatures. In the twelfth/thirteenth century the initials were overpainted with red, partly covering the earlier largely flaked or faded blue. The shape of the new red initials is different from the original blue ones (the E is rounded, not pointed like in the ninth century; the Π is taller and slimmer). This is a case where the ninth-century painted initials prove that the intense blue of the miniatures is the original colour rather than a later addition.
14. The folio that previously stood between today's folios 62v-63r (not printed in Ščepkina's facsimile) has been cut out almost entirely. Only a small strip of the parchment is still in place, with the initials of the now lost verses. The page must have been illustrated because traces of paint survive at the lower part of the strip and three initials (O, E, and a second E) were

painted in a green-blue, partly covered by the red of the twelfth/thirteenth-century rewritten initials.

15. Folio 84v (figs 117, 214). Two arrow-like reference marks, above the head of the woman in haemorrhage and above the word “iniquities” of Psalm 84:3, are painted in the dark green that is used also for the leaves of the tree, the outline of Christ’s halo, and the myrrh bottle in the hands of the prostitute. This colour must be original because it appears on the initial A of verse 3, partly covered by the twelfth/thirteenth-century red initial.
16. Folio 90v (fig. 215). The large twelfth/thirteenth-century red initial K of Psalm 89:1 was painted over a smaller ninth-century initial written in the same blue as used for Moses’ sleeve and Christ’s medallion.

To the above examples we may add another, most significant one:

17. Folio 54v (fig. 216). Arrow-like reference marks are painted in the same dark blue as used for the clothes of various figures in the miniatures. The vertical arrow next to Christ’s arrest refers to the scene where the Jews oppose Christ’s words at the bottom of the page. This reference mark appears next to the initial O of the relevant Psalm 55:6. The letter is written in the sepia ink of the original script and has the characteristic ninth-century pointed shape. Its left side is painted with the same dark blue. This is certainly ninth century, because when the text was rewritten this O no longer functioned as initial and there was no reason to emphasize it by colouring it. The new red initial was painted in the line above the ninth-century one at the beginning of the relevant verse 6 (a case where the rewritten text does not exactly follow the original script).

The above examples prove beyond doubt that in the ninth century certain initials were coloured to work as reference marks. In the following examples the coloured initials are not covered by the twelfth/thirteenth century red ones, but are combined with them. It seems that when rewriting the text, the painted initials were completed and emphasized with red without being overwritten.

18. Folio 33v (fig. 218). Three blue cross-like dotted reference marks connect the miniature with Psalm 35:13. The initial E of the same verse (in the typical ninth-century pointed shape) was painted in the same dark blue, which is also used for the clothes of Christ and two of the Jews. The red horizontal line of the E belongs to the twelfth/thirteenth-century rewriting phase. The blue of the initial, as well as the reference marks and the clothes in the miniature, may be original ninth-century (cf. the same blue on folios 45v-46r and 54v, numbers 13, 17 above).
19. Folio 35r (figs 219-20). Three crosses painted in the green of the olive tree that grows from the head of Charity appear above the words “gives alms” and “lends” of Psalm 36:26 and next to the female personification. The olive tree and the reference marks seem original ninth-century. So does the initial O of verse 26, painted with the same green colour outlining the sepia letter of the original script (ninth-century pointed shape). The red initial of the twelfth/thirteenth century is written inside the original one.
20. Folio 44r (fig. 102). This contains various reference marks in the blue also used in the miniatures. The typically ninth-century pointed initials O and E of Psalms 43:23 and 44:2 are partly outlined in the same dark blue which may be original (cf. numbers 13, 17, 18 above). The O was completed and the E outlined with the twelfth/thirteenth-century red used for all the rewritten initials. Colouring only the left side of an initial O is also attested in the undoubtedly original ninth-century initial on folio 54v (number 17).
21. Folio 46v (figs 195, 221). The diagonal right side of the initial A (Psalm 46:7) and a reference mark below it are in the same dark blue as used on the angels’ wings and Christ’s mandorla in the relevant Ascension scene. The letter was completed in the red ink of the other rewritten initials of the twelfth/thirteenth century. The dark blue may be original ninth-century (cf. numbers 13, 17, 18, 20); the shape of the initial A is typically ninth-century. Colouring only the diagonal right side of an initial A is attested in the undoubtedly original ninth-century initial on folio 13v (number 11).
22. Folio 55v (figs 196, 222). The left and central part of the initial Y of Psalm 56:5 is in the same dark blue as used for two reference marks, the angels’ wings and Christ’s mandorla in the Ascension scene. This colour may be original (cf. numbers 13, 17, 18, 20, 21). The initial Y was

completed with the red of the rewritten initials. Its shape is in the ninth-century script, different from the completely rewritten Y seen in the verse directly above it (cf. also the Y in figs 4, 211, 223, 231 – the original ninth-century elongated shape is visible below the squat rewritten red initial of the twelfth/thirteenth century). Examples number 11 and 17 indicate that it was not uncommon for the ninth-century painter to paint only part of the initial signalling the verse connected to the illustration (cf. also numbers 20 and 21).

23. Folio 82v (figs 186, 223). The undulating reference lines above the miniature and the word “rise” of Psalm 81:8 are of the same light-blue colour as used in Christ’s mandorla, Adam’s and Eve’s clothes, and Hades’ beard. This must be original ninth-century. The diagonal right side of the initial A in verse 8 was painted with the same colour, still partly visible below the later rewriting of the letter in red ink (cf. numbers 11 and 21).
24. Folio 92v (fig. 224). It seems that before the initial O of Psalm 90:11 was rewritten in red ink in the twelfth/thirteenth century, its left side was painted in the dark blue used also for the roof of the church in the miniature. This side of the letter had the pointed shape of the ninth-century initials (cf. numbers 17 and 20 for the colouring of only half the letter O, and numbers 13, 17, 20-22 for the dark blue colour).
25. Folio 96v (fig. 225). The reference marks of the page and the initial E of Psalm 95:10 are painted in the same dark blue as Christ’s mantle, which may be original (cf. numbers 13, 17, 20-22, 24). The initial E has the ninth-century pointed shape. Only the horizontal central line of the letter was added in the red ink of the rewritten initials.
26. Folio 116r (fig. 226). The reference marks relating Psalm 111:9 to the miniature are of the same bright green as the tree growing from the head of the charitable man. Corrigan considers this colour retouched in the twelfth/thirteenth century,⁹²⁴ but there is evidence that it might be original: the characteristically pointed ninth-century initial E of verse 9 is painted in the same colour. The letter was completed in the red ink of the rewritten

⁹²⁴ Corrigan (1992), 143.

initials (with a red line doubling the inside curve of the green E and adding the central horizontal stroke).

There are also two instances where the dark blue of the painted initials appears attached to the rewritten red initials of the twelfth/thirteenth century as if it had been added to them when the miniatures were retouched. However, the form of the letters themselves may argue otherwise.

27. Folio 51v (figs 3, 227). The initial I of Psalm 51:9 consists of two parts: the rewritten red I, which doubles the dark blue left with an equally thick line and a reference mark to the left of that. The same blue is used for Simon's mantle and is comparable to the dark blue that may be original in the examples of numbers 13, 17, 20-22, and 24 above. Like the blue line, the red part of the letter is a straight line and does not have the more ornamental form of the rewritten red initial I which appears on other pages, with a broader base and top and small horizontal element in the middle (e.g. fig. 102). This might mean that when the red part of the initial was painted it simply followed the blue line that already existed there from the ninth century.

28. Folios 109v-110r (figs 88, 228). The reference marks are painted in the same dark blue as the clothes of various figures in the miniatures, similar to the blue of the examples mentioned above (numbers 13, 17, 20-22, 24, 27). The initial K of verses 30 and 37 (Psalm 105) is in the red ink of the twelfth/thirteenth-century rewriting, but its upright stroke is also doubled on the left in the same dark blue, next to which there is a reference mark. The shape of the K in these two initials is plain, unlike the ornamental form of the other rewritten Ks on the same and facing folio (with small horizontal strokes at the ends of the vertical, and sometimes the diagonal lines of the letter, figs 88-89, 228). This might mean that when these two red initials were painted they simply followed the vertical blue line that probably already existed since the ninth century, marking the left stroke of the original letter. Otherwise, if the blue parts of the initials (and the reference marks) were later retouching, they must have followed the shape of pre-existing ninth-century features exactly.

There are also a few instances where the coloured initials were neither overpainted nor completed in the red ink of the rewritten initials. They must have been coloured already in the ninth century, and were left untouched when the other initials were rewritten (before any colours could be added to the miniatures).

29. Folio 10v (fig. 110). The initial T of Psalm 11:5 is painted in the same dark blue colour as used on the angel's wings, on the clothes of men, and a segment of sky in the miniature above. It is similar to the dark blue mentioned in numbers 13, 17, 20-22, 24, 27, and 28 above. Since this letter is actually painted above the angel's wing, it must certainly be original ninth-century (the painter covered the initial with his miniature and then rewrote it in colour so that it would be easily visible).
30. Folio 47v (fig. 229). The initial T of Psalm 48:4 is partly highlighted above the sepia ink of the original script in the same dark blue as the reference mark next to it, the decorative elements on John Chrysostom's clothes, and the outline of his halo. (Cf. the dark blue mentioned in numbers 13, 17, 20-22, 24, 27-29).
31. Folio 62v (fig. 42). The initial E of Psalm 64:14 and the reference marks are painted in the same blue and green as the two segments of sky and the rays of light in the Pentecost scene. The letter has the characteristically pointed ninth-century shape.
32. Folio 88v (fig. 250). The initial T of Psalm 88:13 and the reference marks are painted in the bright green also used for the trees on Mount Thabor in the Transfiguration scene. This is another example of a bright colour that may be original ninth-century and not retouched.

Many of the above examples indicated that bright and intense colours of the miniatures and the relevant reference marks were not necessarily retouching, but may be the original colours of the illustration. This could mean that many other miniatures and reference marks in similar colours may also belong to the ninth century rather than the twelfth/thirteenth, and this seems to me to be the case – for example on folios 5v, 9v (fig. 149), 33r, 63v (fig. 185), 64r (fig. 184), 77v, 85v, 86r, 86v (fig. 189), 88r (fig. 106), 89r (fig. 131), 97v, 98v (fig. 146), 100v (fig. 187), 101v

(fig. 122), 105v. Generally speaking, my brief examination of the Chludov Psalter gave me the impression that retouching may have been less extensive than is believed. Obviously, since my access to the manuscript was restricted, this problem and the question of reference marks could not be resolved, and my tentative impression needs a more extensive study, which I hope to undertake in the future. Anyway, even if most of the reference marks in the Chludov Psalter are painted in colours of the twelfth/thirteenth-century retouching phase, they could simply be reviving original signs which had faded. After all, at least part of the above evidence clearly proves that a number of reference marks (in the form of sings or painted initials) are originals painted in the ninth century (see numbers 1-17, 29).

Bibliography

Abbreviations

AB = *Analecta Bollandiana*

ArtB = *The Art Bulletin*

BMGS = *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*

ByzF = *Byzantinische Forschungen*

BZ = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*

CA = *Cahiers archéologique*

DACL = *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*

DOP = *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*

ΔΧΑΕ = *Δελτίον Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*

JÖB = *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*

JWalt = *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery*

JWarb = *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*

Mansi = G. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 53 volumes, Paris – Leipzig 1901-27.

MMJ = *Metropolitan Museum Journal*

MonPiot = *Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres: Fondation Eugène Piot*

OCP = *Orientalia christiana periodica*

ODB = *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*

PG = *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne, 161 volumes, Paris 1857-66.

RbK = *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*

REB = *Revue des études Byzantines*

SC = *Sources chrétiennes*

TM = *Travaux et Mémoires*

Primary Sources

(In alphabetical order under author's name or title)

Acts of the First Ecumenical Council, Mansi II, 641-946.

Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council, Mansi III, 527-600.

Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council, Mansi IV, 575-V, 464.

Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, Mansi VI, 529-VII, 868.

Acts of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, Mansi IX, 183-658.

Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, Mansi XI, 189-922.

Acts of the Quinisext Council, Mansi IX, 921-1006; 'The Canons of the Council in Trullo, in Greek, Latin and English', in G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone, eds, *The Council in Trullo Revisited* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, KANONIKA 6), Rome 1995.

Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, Mansi XII, 959-XIII, 496.

Adversus Constantinum Cabalinum: *Oratio demonstrativa, de sacris et venerandis imaginibus, Ad Christianos omnes, adversusque imperatorem Constantinum Cabalinum ac haereticos universos*, PG 95, 309-44.

Amphilochios of Iconium

Opera: *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera. Orationes, pluraque alia quae supersunt, nonnulla etiam spuria*, ed. C. Datema, Leuven 1978.

Anastasios of Sinai

Viae Dux: *Anastasio Sinaitae Viae Dux*, ed. K.-H. Uthermann, Leuven 1981.

Andrew of Crete

Magnus canon, PG 97, 1329-1386.

Apollinarios of Laodikeia

In psalmos: 'Apollinaris von Laodicea zu Psalm 1 bis 50', ed. E. Mühlenberg, in *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, I-III, Berlin – New York 1975-78, vol. I, 3-118.

Asterios of Amaseia

Homilies: *Asterius of Amasea, Homilies I-XIV*, ed. C. Datema, Leiden 1970.

In psalmos: *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in psalmos quae supersunt accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae*, ed. M. Richard, Oslo 1956.

Athanasios of Alexandria

In psalmos: *Expositio in psalmos*, PG 27, 59-590.

Epistola ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum, PG 27, 11-46.

Basil of Caesarea

In psalmos: Homiliae in psalmos, PG 29, 209-494.

Canon in erectione SS. imaginum, PG 99, 1767-80.

Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos

De cerimoniis: Le livre des cérémonies, ed. and trans. A. Vogt, I-II, Paris 1935.

Cyril of Alexandria

Festive Letters: Cyrille d'Alexandrie Lettres Festales I-XI, ed. and trans. P. Évieux, W. H. Burns, L. Arragon, M.-O. Boulnois, M. Forrat, B. Meunier, R. Monier, I-II, Paris 1991-93.

In psalmos: Expositio in psalmos, PG 69, 699-1274.

Didymos the Blind

In psalmos: 'Didymus der Blinde zu Psalm 1 bis 150', ed. E. Mühlenberg, in *Psalmenkommentare aus der Ketenenüberlieferung*, I-III, Berlin – New York 1975-78, vol. I, 121-375, vol. II, 3-367.

Diodoros of Tarsos

In psalmos: Diodori Tarsensis commentarii in psalmos, I, commentarii in psalmos I-L, ed. J.-M. Olivier, Leuven 1980.

Disputatio adversus Judaeos Anastassi abbatis, PG 89, 1203-1282.

Epiphanius of Cyprus

Panarion: S. P. N. Epiphanii Constantiae que in Cypro est episcopi adversus octoginta haeresis opus quod inscribitur panarium sive arcula, PG 41, 155-1200, PG 42, 9-888.

Euchologion: Μικρόν εὐχολόγιον ἢ ἀγιασματάριον, Ἑκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Athens 1998 (13th edition).

Eusebios of Caesarea

De laudibus Constantini oratio in ejus tricennalibus habita, PG 20, 1315-1440.

Epistola ad Constantiam augustam, PG 20, 1545-50.

Historiae Ecclesiasticae, PG 20, 45-906.

In psalmos: Commentaria in Psalmos, PG 23, 63-1396.

Euthymios Zigabenos

Commentarius in Matthaeum, Marcum, Lucam, Joannem, PG 129, 107-1502.

In psalmos: Commentarius in psalterium, PG 128, 41-1326.

Evagrius Scholastikos

Ecclesiastical History: The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the scholia, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, Amsterdam 1964.

Genesios

Regum libri quattuor Iosephi Genesii, ed. A. Lesmueller-Werner and I. Thurn, Berlin 1978; trans. A. Kaldellis, *Genesios on the Reign of the emperors*, Canberra 1998.

George the Monk

Chronikon: Georgii monachi Chronicon, ed. C. de Boor 1904, corrected by P. Wirth, Stuttgart 1978.

Germanos of Constantinople

De haeresibus et synodis: Ad Anthimum diaconum narratio de sanctis synodis et de subortis jam inde ab origine apostolicae praedicationis haeresibus, PG 98, 39-88.

Epistolae dogmaticae, PG 98, 147-222.

Ecclesiastical History: ed. S. C. Parson, 'The Historia Ecclesiastica of Germanus I of Constantinople: a study in Greek liturgical symbolism', *Church and Theology* 3 (1982), 5-66; ed. and trans. P. Meyendorff, *St. Germanos of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy*, New York 1984.

Orationes, PG 98, 221-384.

Gregory of Nyssa

De Vita Moysis: Grégoire de Nysse, La vie de Moïse ou traité de la perfection en matière de vertu, ed. and trans. J. Danielou, Paris 1955.

In psalmos: Tractatus in psalmorum inscriptiones, PG 44, 431-616; trans. R. E. Heine, *Gregory of Nyssa's Treatise on the Inscriptions of the Psalms*, Oxford 1995.

Sermones, pars I, ed. G. Heil, A. van Heck, E. Gebhardt, A. Spira, Leiden 1967.

Hesychios of Jerusalem

In psalmos: Fragmenta in psalmos, PG 93, 1179-1340.

Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, *The New International Version*, ed. A. Marshall, Grand Rapids 1976.

John Chrysostom

Eight baptismal catecheses: *Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites*, ed. and trans. A. Wenger, SC 50, Paris 1970 (2nd edition).

In psalmos: *Expositio in psalmos*, PG 55, 35-498.

Homiliae in psalmos, PG 55, 499-528.

In psalmum L and Proemia in psalmos (dubia), PG 55, 527-34.

Argumentum psalmoreum and In psalmos (spuria), PG 55, 533-784.

Three baptismal catecheses: *Trois catéchèses baptismales*, ed. and trans. A. Piédagnel and L. Doutreleau, SC 366, Paris 1990.

John of Damascus

Contra imaginum columniatores orationes tres, ed. P. B. Kotter (*Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, III*), Berlin – New York 1975; trans. D. Anderson, *Three apologies against those who attack the divine images*, New York 1997.

De duabus voluntatibus: *De duabus in Christo voluntatibus et operationibus*, PG 95, 127-186.

Exposition fidei, ed. P. B. Kotter (*Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, II*), Berlin – New York 1973.

Kosmas Indikopleustes

Christian Topography: *Topographie chrétienne*, ed. W. Wolska-Conus, I-III, Paris 1968-73.

Leontios of Neapolis

Contra Judaeos: *Leontii episcopi Neapoleos Cyrpi, ex quinto sermone pro Christianorum apologia contra Judaeos, ac de imaginibus sanctorum*, PG 93, 1597-1610.

Leontions presbyter of Constantinople

Homilies: *Leontii presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae*, ed. C. Datema and P. Allen, Leuven 1987; trans. P. Allen and C. Datema, *Leontius presbyter of Constantinople, Fourteen Homilies*, Brisbane 1991.

Letter of the Three Patriarchs: *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilos and Related Texts*, ed. and trans. J. A. Munitiz, J. Chrysostomides, E. Harvalia-Crook, Ch. Dendrinos, Camberley 1997.

Life of Empress Eirene: F. Halkin, 'Deux impératrices de Byzance', *AB* 106 (1988), 5-34, 'I. La vie de l'impératrice sainte Irène et le second concile de Nicée en 787', 5-27.

Life of Empress Theodora: F. Halkin, 'Deux impératrices de Byzance', *AB* 106 (1988), 5-34, 'II. L'impératrice sainte Théodora († 867)', 27-34.

Life of Empress Theodora: Α. Μαρκόπουλος, 'Βίος τῆς αὐτοκράτειρας Θεοδώρας', *Σύμμεικτα* 5 (1983), 249-85.

Life of Euthymos of Sardis: J. Gouillard, 'La vie d'Euthyme de Sardes († 831), une oeuvre du patriarche Méthode', *TM* 10 (1987), 1-89.

Life of Euthymios of Sardis: A. Papadakis, 'The Unpublished Life of Euthymios of Sardis: Bodleianus Laudianus Graecus 69', *Traditio* 26 (1970), 63-89.

Life of Michael Synkellos: *The Life of Michael the Synkellos*, ed. and trans. M. B. Cunningham, Belfast 1991.

Life of Nikephoros of Sevaze: F. Halkin, 'Une victime inconnue de Léon l'arménien? Saint Nicéphore de Sébazè', *Byzantion* 23 (1953), 11-30.

Life of Stephen the Younger: *La vie d'Etienne le Jeune par Etienne le Diacre*, ed. and trans. M.-F. Auzépy, Variorum 1997.

Life of Tarasios: *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon*, ed. and trans. S. Efthymiadis, Aldershot – Brookfield USA – Singapore – Sydney 1998.

Methodios of Constantinople

De iis qui abnegarunt: *De iis qui abnegarunt secundum diversas personas, et aetates, et ad orthodoxam veramque fidem revertuntur*, *PG* 100, 1299-1326.

Michael the Synkellos

Vita Dionysii Areopagitae: *Michaelis syngeli presbyteri hierosolymitani encomium beati Dionysii areopagitae*, *PG* 4, 617-668.

Nikephoros of Constantinople

Antirrhethici tres adversus Constantinum Copronymum, *PG* 100, 205-534.

Apologeticus pro sacris imaginibus, *PG* 100, 533-834.

Apologeticus minor, *PG* 100, 833-850.

Chronographia brevis: Nicehpori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani *Opuscula Historica*, ed. C. De Boor, Lipsiae 1880; reprinted, New York 1975, Arno Press.

Contra Eusebium, ed. J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense* 1 (1852), 371-503.

Epistola ad Leonem III papam: *Epistola Nicephori constantinopolitani ad Leonem pontificem maximum*, PG 100, 169-200.

Refutatio et eversio: *Nicephori patriarchae constantinopolitani refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*, ed. J. M. Featherstone, Leuven 1997.

Twelve chapters: Δώδεκα κεφάλαια κατά τῶν εἰκονομάχων καί Μανιχαίων, in Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ανάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, I-V, St Petersburg 1891-98, vol. I, 454-60; reprinted, Brussels 1963.

Nouthesia: *Νουθεσία γέροντος περί τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων*, in Α. Μιτσίδης, *Ἡ παρουσία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Κύπρου εἰς τόν ἀγῶνα ὑπέρ τῶν εἰκόνων. Γεώργιος ὁ Κύπριος καί Κωνσταντῖνος Κωνσταντίας*, Nicosia 1989, παράρτημα Α', 153-192.

Origen

In psalmos: *Commentariis in psalmos*, PG 12, 1053-1686.

Commentarius in Matthaeum: *Commentaria in evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, PG 13, 829-1600.

Photios of Constantinople

Amphilochia: *Photii patriarchae constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ed. Westerink, IV-VI, Leipzig 1986-88.

Bibliotheca: *Bibliothèque*, ed. and trans. R. Henry, I-VIII, Paris 1959-77.

Epistulae: *Photii patriarchae constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L. Westerink, I-III, Leipzig 1983-85.

Homilies: *Φωτίου Ὁμιλῖαι*, ed. B. Λούρδας, Thessaloniki 1959; trans. C. Mango, *The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1958.

Proclos of Constantinople

Consolatoria ad aegrotum: ed. Rydberg, 'Proclus oratio 36 "consolatoria ad aegrotum"', *Le Muséon* 72 (1959), 301-22.

New Homilies: *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople, Tradition manuscrite, inédits, études connexes*, F. J. Leroy, Vatican City 1967.

Pseudo-Athanasios

De titulis psalmorum, PG 27, 649-1344.

Pseudo-Damaskenos

Letter to Theophilos: *Pseudo-Damascene, Letter to Emperor Theophilos on the Holy and Venerated Icons*, in *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor*

Theophilos and Related Texts, ed. and trans. J. A. Munitiz, J. Chrysostomides, E. Harvalia-Crook, Ch. Dendrinos, Camberley 1997, 141-205.

Romanos Melodos

Cantica: *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica, Cantica Genuina*, ed. P. Maas and C. A. Trypanis, Oxford 1963.

Synodikon of Orthodoxy: A. Gouillard, 'Les Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie, edition et commentaire', *TM* 2 (1967), 1-131.

Synodikon Vetus: *The Synodicon Vetus*, ed. and trans. J. Duffy and J. Parker, Washington, D.C. 1979.

Textus Byzantinos ad iconomachiam pertinentes, ed. H. Hennephof, Leiden 1969.

The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English, ed. C. L. Brenton, Hendrickson Publishers 1997.

Theodore the Studite

Adversus iconomachos capita septem, PG 99, 485-495.

Antirrhetici tres adversos iconomachos, PG 99, 327-436; trans. C. P. Roth, *On the Holy Icons*, New York 1981.

Epistulae: *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros, Berlin 1992.

Refutatio et subversio impiorum poematum, PG 99, 327-485.

Theodore of Cyros

In psalmos: *Interpretatio in psalmos*, PG 80, 857-2002.

Theophylaktos of Ochrid

Enarratio in evangelium Matthaei, Marci, Lucae, Joannis, PG 123, 143-1348.

Triodion: *Τριώδιον κατανοητικόν περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν τῆς Ἀγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς*, Ἑκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Athens 1994.

Typikon of the Church of the Anastasis: 'Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας. Διάταξις τῶν ἱερῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς μεγάλης τῶν παθῶν ἐβδομάδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας ἔθος, ἥτοι τὸ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Ἑκδίδεται δὲ κατὰ κώδικα τοῦ 1122-ου ἔτους', in Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, I-V, St Petersburg 1891-98, vol. II, 1-254; reprinted, Brussels 1963.

Typikon of the Great Church: *Le typicon de la Grande Église*, Ms. Sainte-Croix n° 40, Xe siècle, ed. and trans. J. Mateos, I-II, Rome 1962-63.

Typikon of the Monastery of the Saviour: *Le typicon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, codex Messinensis gr. 115, A.D. 1131*, ed. and trans. M. Arranz, Rome 1969.

Vita Germani, in L. Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I. von Konstantinopel (715-730). Versuch einer endgültigen chronologischen Fixierung des Lebens und Wirkens des Patriarchen, mit dem griechisch-deutschen Text der Vita Germani*, Würzburg 1975, 200-240.

Vita Ignatii: S. P. N. Ignatii Archiepiscopi constantinopolitani vita sive certamen, auctore Niceta servo Jesu Christi, cognomento David Paphlagone, PG 105, 487-574.

Vita Joannis Damasceni: Vita S. P. N. Joannis Damasceni a Joanne patriarcha hierosolimitano conscripta, PG 94, 429-90.

Vita Josephi hymnographi: S. Josephi hymnographi vita auctore Joanne diacono CP., PG 105, 931-976.

Vita Methodii: Vita S. Methodii patriarchae constantinopolitanae, auctore coaevo, interprete Leone Allatio, PG 100, 1243-1262.

Vita Nicephori: S. P. N. Nicephori Constantinopolitani Archiepiscopi vita scripta ab Ingnatio diacono et cimeliarcha sanctissimae et magnae ecclesiae Sanctae Sophiae, ejus discipulo, PG 100, 41-168.

Vita Nicolai Studitae: Anonymi vita S. Nicolai Studitae, PG 105, 863-926.

Vita Theodori Studitae: Vita et conversatio sancti patris nostri et confessoris Theodori praepositi Studitarum, conscripta a Michaele monacho, PG 99, 113-232, and Vita et conversatio sancti patris nostri et convessoris Theodori abbatis monasterii Studii, a Michaele monacho conscripta, PG 99, 233-328.

Secondary Literature

Age of Spirituality (1979): K. Weitzmann, ed., *Age of Spirituality, Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century* (exhibition catalogue), New York.

Alexander P. J. (1953): ‘The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and its Definition (Horos)’, *DOP* 7, 35-66.

Alexander P. J. (1958): ‘Church Councils and Patristic Authority, The Iconoclastic Councils of Hieria (754) and St. Sophia (815)’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63, 493-505.

Alexander P. J. (1958a): *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image worship in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford.

Alexander S. S. (1977): ‘Heraclius, Byzantine Imperial Ideology, and the David Plates’, *Speculum* 52, 217-37.

Anagnostakis E. (2001): Η. Αναγνωστάκης, ‘«Περιούσιος λαός»’, in Ε. Κουντούρα-Γαλάκη, ed., *Οι Σκοτεινοί αιώνες του Βυζαντίου, 7^{ος}-9^{ος} αι.* (Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών, Διεθνή Συμπόσια 9), Athens.

Anastos M. V. (1954): ‘The Argument for Iconoclasm as presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754’, in K. Weitzmann, ed., *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in honor of Albert Mathias Friend Jr.*, Princeton, 177-88.

Anderson J. C. (1983): ‘The Date and Purpose of the Barberini Psalter’, *CA* 31, 35-60.

Anderson J. C. (1988): ‘On the Nature of the Theodore Psalter’, *ArtB* 70, 550-68.

Anderson J. C. (1994): ‘The Palimpsest Psalter, Pantokrator Cod. 61: its content and relationship to the Bristol Psalter’, *DOP*, 48, 199-220.

Anderson J. C. (1998): ‘Further Prolegomena to a Study of the Pantokrator Psalter: An unpublished Miniature, Some Restored Losses, and Observations on the Relationship with the Chludov Psalter and Paris Fragment’, *DOP* 52, 305-321.

Anderson J. C. – Canart P. – Walter C. (1989): *The Barberini Psalter, Codex Vaticanus Barberinianus Graecus 372*, Zurich – New York.

Antonopoulos E. (1981): ‘Miséricorde, olivier: agents et attributs’, *Byzantion* 51, 345-85.

Auzépy M.-F. (1997): See *Life of Stephen the Younger* (Primary Sources, above).

Auzépy M.-F. (1999): *L’hagiographie et l’iconoclasm byzantin. Le cas de la Vie d’Étienne le Jeune*, Aldershot – Brookfield USA – Singapore – Sydney.

- Baltogianni C. (1994):** Χ. Μπαλτογιάννη, *Εικόνες, Μήτηρ Θεού*, Athens.
- Bancalari F. (1894):** 'Index codicum graecorum bibliothecae Casanatensis', *Studi Italiani di filologia classica* 2, 161-207.
- Barag D. – Wilkinson J. (1974):** 'The Monza-Bobbio flasks and the Holy Sepulchre', *Levant* 6, 179-187.
- Barber C. (2000):** 'Reading in the Theodore Psalter', in C. Barber, ed., *Theodore Psalter, Electronic facsimile*, University of Illinois Press in association with the British Library, essay 1.
- Barber C. (2000a):** 'Authority, mimesis, and prayer: Prolegomenon to an abbot's reading of the Theodore Psalter', in C. Barber, ed., *Theodore Psalter, Electronic facsimile*, University of Illinois Press in association with the British Library, essay 3.
- Belting H. (1994):** *Likeness and Presence, A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago.
- Bertoli B. (1986):** *I mosaici di San Marco*, Milan.
- Biddle M. (1999):** *The Tomb of Christ*, Stroud.
- Blake R. (1939):** 'Note sur l'activité littéraire du Patriarch Nicéphore de Constantinople', *Byzantion* 14, 1-15.
- Brown P. (1973):** 'A Dark Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy', *English Historical Review* 346, 1-34; reprinted in *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, London 1982, 251-301.
- Brubaker L. (1981):** 'The tabernacle miniatures of the Byzantine octateuchs', *Actes du XVe Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines II: Art et Archéologie*, Athens, 73-92.
- Brubaker L. (1985):** 'Politics, patronage, and art in the ninth-century Byzantium: The Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus in Paris (B. N. Gr. 510)', *DOP* 39, 1-13.
- Brubaker L. (1989):** 'Perception and conception: art, theory and culture in ninth-century Byzantium', *Word and Image* 5, 19-32.
- Brubaker L. (1989a):** 'Byzantine art in the ninth century: theory, practice, and culture', *BMGS* 13, 23-93.
- Brubaker L. (1999):** *Vision and Meaning in ninth-century Byzantium. Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus*, Cambridge.
- Brubaker L. (1999a):** 'The Chalke gate, the construction of the past, and the Trier ivory', *BMGS* 23, 258-85.

Brubaker L. – Haldon J. (2001): *Byzantium in the iconoclast era (ca 680-850): the sources*, Aldershot – Burlington USA – Singapore – Sydney.

Buchthal H. (1938): *The Miniatures of the Paris Psalter*, London.

Buchthal H. (1974): 'The Exaltation of David', *JWarb* 37, 330-333.

Byzance et les images (1994): *Byzance et les images, Cycle de conférences organisé au musée du Louvre par le Service culturel du 5 octobre au 7 décembre 1992*, Paris.

Byzantine Art (1964): *Byzantine Art, An European Art* (exhibition catalogue), Athens.

Byzantine Court Culture (1997): H. Maguire, ed., *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, Washington D.C.

Byzantium (2002): M. Evangelatou, H. Papastavrou, and T.-P. Skotti, eds, *Byzantium: An Ecumenical Empire* (exhibition catalogue), Athens.

Cameron Av. (1992): 'The Language of Images: the Rise of Icons and Christian Representation', in D. Wood, ed., *The Church and the Arts* (Studies in Church History 28), Oxford, 1-42.

Canart P. (1979): 'Le Patriarch Méthode de Constantinople. Copiste à Rome', *Paleographica, Diplomatica et Archivistica, Studi in onore de Giulio Battelli*, Rome, 343-53.

Carr A. Weyl (1973): *The Rockefeller McCormick New Testament: Studies toward the reattribution of Chicago University Library, MS. 965*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan.

Carr A. Weyl (1976): 'The Psalter Benaki 34.3, An unpublished illuminated manuscript from the Family 2400', *REB* 34, 281-323.

Carr A. Weyl (2000): 'The Presentation of an Ikon on Cyprus: The Virgin Veiled by God, in E. Sears and Th. Thomson, eds, *Reading Medieval Images*, Ann Arbor, forthcoming.

Carr A. Weyl forthcoming: *Pursuing the Life of an Icon, The Virgin of Kykkos*.

Cecchelli C. – Furlani G. – Salmi M. (1959): *The Rabbula Gospels. Facsimile Edition of the Miniatures of the Syriac Manuscript Plut. I, 56 in the Medicean-Laurentian Library*, Olten – Lausanne.

Charib G. (1993): *Le icone di Christo, storia e culto*, Rome.

Chatzidaki N. (1996): N. Χατζηδάκη, *Όσιος Λουκάς*, Athens.

Clair A. S. (1979): 'The Visit to the Tomb: Narrative and Liturgy on Three Early Christian Pyxides', *Gesta* 18, 127-35.

- Clair A. S. (1984):** 'The Basilewsky pyxis: typology and topography in the exodus tradition', *CA* 32, 15-30.
- Clark K. W. (1953):** *Checklist of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates in Jerusalem*, Washington D.C.
- Congar Y. M. J. (1958):** *Le mystère du temple*, Paris.
- Constantinidi C. (1991):** Χ. Κωνσταντινίδη, *Ο Μελισμός. Οι συλλειτουργούντες ιεράρχες μπροστά στην αγ. Τράπεζα με τα τίμια δώρα ή τον ευχαριστακό Χριστό*, Ph.D. Thesis, Athens.
- Cormack R. (1985):** *Writing in Gold, Byzantine Society and its Icons*, Oxford.
- Cormack R. (1997):** *Painting the Soul, Icons, Death Masks and Shrouds*, London.
- Corrigan K. (1988):** 'The witness of John the Baptist on an Early Byzantine Icon in Kiev', *DOP* 42, 2-11.
- Corrigan K. (1992):** *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters*, Cambridge.
- Crehan J. H. (1966):** 'Patristic Evidence for the Inspiration of Councils', *Studia Patristica* 9, Texte und Untersuchungen 94, Berlin, 210-15.
- Ćurčić S. (1991):** 'Late Byzantine *Loca Sancta*? Some Questions Regarding the Form and Function of Epitaphioi', in S. Ćurčić and D. Mouriki, eds, *The Twilight of Byzantium, Aspects of Cultural and Religious History in the Late Byzantine Empire, Papers from the Colloquium Held at Princeton University, 8-9 May 1989*, Princeton, 251-70.
- Cutler A. (1977):** 'The marginal psalter in the Walters Art Gallery. A reconsideration', *JWalt* 35, 37-61.
- Cutler A. (1978):** 'A Psalter from Mâr Saba and the Evolution of the Byzantine David Cycle', *Journal of Jewish Art* 6, 39-63; reprinted in *Imagery and Ideology in Byzantine Art* (Variorum Collected Studies), Ashgate 1992, V.
- Cutler A. (1980-81):** 'Liturgical strata in the marginal Psalters', *DOP* 34-5, 17-30.
- Cutler A. (1984):** *The Aristocratic Psalters in Byzantium*, Paris.
- Cutler A. (1992):** 'Πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ: Ezekiel and the Politics of Resurrection in Tenth-Century Byzantium', *DOP* 46, 47-58.
- Cutler A. (1992a):** 'The Psalter of Basil II', *Imagery and Ideology in Byzantine Art* (Variorum Collected Studies), Ashgate, III; reprinted from *Arte Veneta* 30 (1976), 9-19 / 31 (1977), 9-15.

- Cutler A. – Oikonomides N. (1988):** ‘An Imperial Byzantine Casket and its Fate at a Humanist’s Hands’, *ArtB* 70, 77-87.
- Dagens M. C. (1966):** ‘Autour de pape Libère. L’iconographie de Suzanne et des martyrs romains sur l’arcosolium de Celerina’, *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 78, 327-81.
- Dagron G. (1996):** *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le “césaropapisme” byzantin*, Paris.
- Danielou J. (1950):** *Les figures du Christ dans l’Ancien Testament*, ‘Sacramentum Futuri’, Paris.
- Danielou J. (1960):** ‘Exegese et typologie patristiques’, *Dictionnaire de spiritualite*, IV, Paris, 132-38.
- Danielou J. (1960a):** J. Danielou, *From shadows to reality, Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, London.
- Darrouzès J. (1987):** ‘Le patriarche Méthode contre les iconoclasts et les stoudites’, *REB* 45, 15-57.
- Delehaye H. (1966):** *Les Passions des Martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Bruxelles 1966 (2nd edition).
- Demus O. (1984):** *The mosaics of San Marco in Venice*, Text I-II, Plates I-II, Chicago.
- Der Nersessian S. (1944-45):** ‘Une apologie des images du septième siècle’, *Byzantion* 17, 58-87.
- Der Nersessian S. (1962):** ‘The illustrations of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus Paris. Gr. 510, a study of the connections between text and images’, *DOP* 16, 197-228.
- Der Nersessian S. (1970):** *L’illustration des Psautiers Grecs du Moyen Age*, Londres, Add. 19.352 (Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologiques V), Paris.
- Der Nersessian S. (1993):** *Miniature Painting in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Century*, I-II, Washington. D.C.
- Devreesse (R.) 1970:** *Les anciens commentateurs des Psaumes*, Vatican.
- De Wald E. T. (1930):** *The Illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter*, Princeton.
- De Wald E. T. (1930a):** *The Stuttgart Psalter*, Princeton.
- De Wald E. T. (1941):** *The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint, III, Psalms and Odes. Part 1: Vaticanus Graecus 1927*, Princeton.

- De Wald E. T. (1942):** *The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint, III, Psalms and Odes. Part 2: Vaticanus Graecus 752*, Princeton.
- Diez E. – Demus O. (1931):** *Byzantine mosaics in Greece*, Cambridge (Mass.).
- Dobschütz E. von (1899):** *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur Christlichen Legende*, Leipzig.
- Dorival G. (1985):** 'La postérité littéraire des chaînes exégétiques grecques', *REB* 43, 209-26.
- Dorival G. (1986-95):** *Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les psaumes. Contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire*, I-IV, Leuven.
- Dufrenne S. (1964):** 'Le Psautier de Bristol et les autres psautiers byzantines', *CA* 14, 159-182.
- Dufrenne S. (1965):** 'Une illustration "Historique" inconnue, du psautier du Mont-Athos, Pantocrator N° 61', *CA* 15, 83-95.
- Dufrenne S. (1966):** *L'illustration des psautiers grecs du moyen age, I, Pantokrator 61, Paris grec. 20, British Museum 40731* (Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologique I), Paris.
- Dufrenne S. (1978):** *Tableaux synoptiques de 15 psautiers medievauux*, Paris.
- Dufrenne S. et alii (1978):** S. Dufrenne – S. Radojčić – R. Stichel – I. Ševčenko – H. Belting, *Der Serbische Psalter, Faksimile-Ausgabe des Cod. slav. 4 der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, München*, Wiesbaden.
- Dunbabin J. (1985):** 'The Maccabees as exemplars in the tenth and eleventh centuries', in K. Walsh and D. Wood, eds, *The Bible in the Medieval World. Essays in memory of Beryl Smalley*, Basil Blackwell.
- Dură N. (1995):** 'The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo: Witnesses of the Canonical Tradition in the East and in the West', in G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone, eds, *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, Rome.
- Dvornik F. (1953):** 'The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm', *DOP* 7, 69-97.
- Džurova A. (1990):** *Tomič Psalter*, Sofia.
- Eberlein J. K. (1982):** *Aparatio regis - revelatio veritatis. Studien zur Darstellung des Vorhangs in der bildenden Kunst von der Späantike bis zum Ende des Mittelalters*, Wiesbaden.
- Eberlein J. K. (1983):** 'The Curtain in Raphael's Sistine Madonna', *ArtB* 65, 61-77.
- Elsner J. (1995):** *Art and the Roman Viewer. The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*, Cambridge.

Epstein A. W. (1986): *Tokali Kilisse: tenth-century metropolitan art in Byzantine Cappadocia*, Washington D.C.

Eustratiadis S. (1930): Μητροπολίτου Λεοντοπόλεως Σωφρονίου Εϋστρατιάδου, *Ἡ Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ ὕμνογραφίᾳ*, Athens.

Evangelatou M. (1998): *Illustrating Theology, The miniatures of the ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters at the cross-roads of iconophile propaganda and liturgical influence*, MA dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, London.

Evangelatou M. (1999): ‘Οι μικρογραφίες του ψαλτηρίου Chludon και η εικονομαχική έριδα: Μερικές νέες ερμηνείες’, in Τ. Κόλιας and Ε. Τσιουρή, eds, *Α΄ Συνάντηση των βυζαντινολόγων της Ελλάδος και της Κύπρου, 25-27 Σεπτεμβρίου 1998, Φιλοσοφική Σχολή Πανεπιστημίου Ιωαννίνων, Εισηγήσεις – Περιλήψεις Ανακοινώσεων*, Ioannina 1999, 147-48.

Evangelatou M. (2000): ‘Ο τάφος και η φάτνη του Χριστού στα βυζαντινά ψαλτήρια του 9^{ου} αιώνα’, *Εικοστός Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινής και Μεταβυζαντινής Αρχαιολογίας και Τέχνης, Πρόγραμμα και περιλήψεις εισηγήσεων και ανακοινώσεων, Αθήνα 12-14 Μαΐου 2000*, Athens 2000, 31-32.

Evangelatou M. (2000a): ‘Οι παραστάσεις της Ανάστασης στα βυζαντινά ψαλτήρια του 9^{ου} αιώνα: οι εικονογραφικές τους ιδιαιτερότητες ερμηνευμένες μέσα από την εικονόφιλη επιχειρηματολογία της εποχής’, in Α. Κόλια-Δερμιτζάκη, Β. Λεονταρίτου, and Τ. Μανιάτη-Κοκκίνη, eds, *Β΄ Συνάντηση Βυζαντινολόγων Ελλάδος και Κύπρου, Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών, 24-26 Σεπτεμβρίου 1999, Εισηγήσεις – Ερευνητικά προγράμματα, Περιλήψεις Ανακοινώσεων*, Athens 2000, 189-90.

Evangelatou M. (2001): ‘Η εικονογράφιση του ψαλμού 151 στο Ψαλτήρι Chludon και ο πιθανός εικονόφιλος συμβολισμός της’, *Εικοστό πρώτο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινής και Μεταβυζαντινής Αρχαιολογίας και Τέχνης, Αθήνα 4-6 Μαΐου 2001, Πρόγραμμα και περιλήψεις εισηγήσεων και ανακοινώσεων*, Athens 2001, 40-41.

Evangelatou M. (2001a): ‘Word and Image in the Chludon Psalter’, *Bulletin of British Byzantine Studies*, 71-72.

Evangelatou M. (2002): ‘Παρατηρήσεις στη σχέση κειμένου και εικονογράφησης στον κώδικα Paris. gr. 923’, in Ι. Βάσσης – Μ. Λουκάκη – Ε. Παπαδοπούλου, eds, *Γ΄ Συνάντηση Βυζαντινολόγων Ελλάδος και Κύπρου, Αφιερωμένη στη μνήμη του Νίκου Οικονομίδη, 22-24 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000, Πανεπιστημιούπολη Ρεθύμνου, Περιλήψεις*, Rethimnon 2003, 119-21.

Evangelatou M. forthcoming: 'Christ's Resurrection in the ninth-century Byzantine Psalters: relating the scene to iconophile arguments about the Holy Sepulchre and relics', in A. Lidov, ed., *Proceedings of the International Symposium "Relics in the Art and Culture of the Eastern Christian World"*, Moscow 2000.

Flusin B. (2000): 'Constuire une nouvelle Jérusalem: Constantinople et les reliques', in M. A. Amir-Moezzi and J. Scheid, eds, *L'orient dans l'histoire religieuse de l'europe. L'invention des origins*, Paris, 51-69.

Forsyth G. – Weitzmann K. (1973): *The Monastery of St Catherine at Mt Sinai: The Church and Fortress of Justinian*, Ann Arbor.

Fournnee J. (1968): 'Architectures symboliques dans le thème iconographique de l'annonciation', *Synthronon, Art et Archéologie de la fin de l'Atniquité et du Moyen Age, Recueil d'études* (Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologiques), Paris, 225-35.

Frazer M. E. (1974): 'Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ', *MMJ* 9, 153-61.

Frolow A. (1963): 'La fin de la querelle iconoclaste et la date des plus anciens psautiers grecs à illustration marginales', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religion* 163, 201-23.

Galatariotou C. (1993): 'Travel and Perception in Byzantium', *DOP* 47, 221-41.

Galavaris G. (1969): *The Illustrations of the Liturgical Homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus*, Princeton.

Galavaris G. (1973): 'Manuscripts and the Liturgy', in G. Vikan, ed., *Illuminated Greek manuscripts from American collections, an exhibition in honor of K. Weitzmann*, Princeton, 20-26.

Gero S. (1975): 'John the Grammarian, the Last Iconoclastic Patriarch of Constantinople. The Man and the Legend', *Byzantina* (Nordisk Tidskrift för Byzantinologi, Uppsala) 4, 25-35.

Gero S. (1975a): 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Byzantine Iconoclasts and its Sources', *BZ* 68, 4-22.

Giakalis A. (1994): *Images of the Divine. The Theology of Icons at the Seventh Ecumenical Council* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 54), Leiden – New York –Köln.

Giannopoulos B. N. (1975): *Αί χριστολογικαί ἀντιλήψεις τῶν εἰκονομάχων*, Athens.

Giannopoulos B. N. (1988): ‘Ἡ ἀποδοχή τῶν αἵρετικῶν κατὰ τήν Ζ΄ Οἰκουμένην Σύνοδον’, *Θεολογία* 59 (Athens), 530-79.

Gioles N. (1990): Ν. Γκιολές, *Ὁ βυζαντινὸς τροῦλλος καὶ τὸ εἰκονογραφικὸ του πρόγραμμα (μέσα 6^{ου} α.-1204)*, Athens.

Gioles N. (2002): ‘Byzantine Imperial Insignia’, in M. Evangelatou, H. Papastavrou, and T.-P. Skotti, eds, *Byzantium: An Ecumenical Empire* (exhibition catalogue), Athens, 63-75.

Goodspeed et alii (1932): E. J. Goodspeed, D. W. Riddle, H. R. Willoughby, *The Rockefeller McCormick New Testament*, Chicago.

Goppelt L. (1982): *Typos. The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, Grand Rapids.

Gouillard J. (1961): ‘Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclasme’, *Byzantion* 31, 371-401.

Gouillard J. (1966): ‘Fragments inédits d’un antirrhétique de Jean le Grammarien’, *REB* 24, 171-81.

Gouillard J. (1969): ‘Art et littérature théologique à Byzance au lendemain de la querelle des images’, *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 12, 1-13.

Grabar A. (1936): *L’empereur dans l’art Byzantin*, Paris; reprinted by Variorum Reprints, London 1971.

Grabar A. (1945): ‘Une fresque visigothique et l’iconographie du silence’, *CA* 1, 124-28; reprinted in *L’art de la fin de l’antiquité et du moyen age*, Paris 1968, 583-588.

Grabar A. (1958): *Ampoules de Terre Sainte (Monza-Bobbio)*, Paris.

Grabar A. (1965): ‘Quelques notes sur les psautiers illustrés byzantins du IX^e siècle’, *CA* 15, 61-82.

Grabar A. (1979-80): ‘Essai sur les plus anciennes representations de la “Resurrection du Christ”’, *MonPiot* 62-63, 105-141.

Grabar A. (1980-81): ‘Sur plusieurs images insolites du Christ dans le psautier Chloudov’, *ΔΧΑΕ* (IV) 10, 11-16.

Grabar A. (1984): *L’Iconoclasme Byzantine, Le Dossier Archéologique*, Paris (2nd edition).

Grondijs L. (1955-57): ‘La Datation des psautiers byzantins et en particulier du psautier Chloudoff’, *Byzantion* 25-27, 591-616.

- Grumel V. (1935):** 'La politique religieuse du patriarche saint Méthode', *Échos d'Orient* 34, 385-401.
- Grumel V. (1959):** 'Les "Douze chapitres contres les iconomaques" de saint Nicéphore de Constantinople', *REB* 17, 127-35.
- Gutmann J. (1977):** 'Noah's Raven in Early Christian and Byzantine Art', *CA* 26, 63-71.
- Hahn C. (1990):** 'Loca Sancta Souvenirs: Sealing the Pilgrim's Experience', in R. Ousterhout, ed., *The Blessing of Pilgrimage*, Urbana and Chicago, 85-96.
- Haldon J. – B. Ward-Perkins (1999):** 'Evidence from Rome for the image of Christ on the Chalke gate in Constantinople', *BMGS* 23, 286-96.
- Havice C. (1978):** *The Hamilton Psalter in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett 78.A.9*, Ph.D. thesis, Pennsylvania State University.
- Havice C. (1984):** 'The Marginal Miniatures in the Hamilton Psalter (Kupferstichkabinett 78.A.9)', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 26, 79-142.
- Hofius O. (1972):** *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19 f. und 10,19 f.*, Tübingen.
- Holy Face (1998):** *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation. Papers from a Colloquium held at the Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome and the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1996*, (Villa Spelman Colloquia 6), Bologna.
- Hutter I. (1993):** *Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturenhandschriften*, vol. 4.1, Oxford Christ Church, Stuttgart.
- Iconoclasm (1977):** A. A. M. Bryer and J. Herrin, eds, *Iconoclasm, Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, Birmingham.
- James L. – Webb R. (1991):** ' "To understand ultimate things and enter secret places": ekphrasis and art in Byzantium', *Art History* 14 (1991), 1-17.
- Jerphanion G. de (1925-28):** *Les église rupestres de Cappadoce I*, Paris.
- Jolivet-Lévy C. (1987):** 'L'image du pouvoir dans l'art byzantin à l'époque de la dynastie macédonienne', *Byzantion* 57, 441-70.
- Jolivet-Lévy C. (1993-94):** 'Le canon 82 du Concile Quinisexte et l'image de l'Agneau: à propos d'une église inedited de Cappadoce', *ΔΧΑΕ* (IV) 17, 45-52; reprinted in *Etudes Cappadociennes*, London 2002, XIII, 399-412.
- Kaldellis A. (1998):** See Genesios, *Regum libri quattuor* (Primary Sources, above).

Karlin P. Hayter (1994): 'A Byzantine Politician Monk: Saint Theodore the Studite', *JÖB* 44, 217-32.

Kartsonis A. (1986): Kartsonis, *Anastasis, the making of an image*, Princeton.

Kartsonis A. (1998): 'The responding icon', in L. Safran, ed., *Heaven on Earth, Art and the Church in Byzantium*, University Park, 58-80.

Kazhdan A. (1999): *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, in collaboration with L. F. Sherry and C. Angelidi, (The National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, Research Series 2), Athens.

Kazhdan A. – Franklin S. (1984): *Studies on Byzantine literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Cambridge.

Kazhdan A. – Maguire H. (1991): 'Byzantine Hagiographical Texts as Sources on Art', *DOP* 45, 1-22.

Kessler H. L. (1973): 'The Psalter', in G. Vikan, ed., *Illuminated Greek manuscripts from American collections, an exhibition in honor of K. Weitzmann*, Princeton, 31-33.

Kessler H. L. (1991): 'Through the Temple Veil: the Holy Image in Judaism and Christianity', *Kairos* 33.

Kessler H. L. (1991-92): '“Pictures Fertile with Truth:” How Christians Managed to Make Images of God without Violating the Second Commandment', *JWalt* 49-50, 53-65.

Kessler H. L. (1993): 'Medieval Art as Argument', in B. Cassidy, ed., *Iconography at the Crossroads. Papers from the colloquium sponsored by the index of Christian Art, Princeton University, 23-24 March 1990*, Princeton, 59-70.

Koukoules Ph. (1952): Φ. Κουκουλές, *Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καί Πολιτισμός*, vol. V, Athens.

Koutrakou N. (1999): 'Defying the Other's Identity: Language of acceptance and rejection of iconoclastic Byzantium', *Byzantion* 69, 107-118.

Krautheimer R. (1942): 'Introduction to an "Iconography of Medieval Architecture"', *JWarb* 5, 1-33; reprinted in *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art*, New York 1969, 115-50.

Kühnel B. (1987): *From the Earthly to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Representations of the Holy City in Christian Art of the First millenium*, Rome – Freiburg – Vienna.

Ladner G. B. (1953): 'The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy', *DOP* 7, 1-34.

- Ladner G. (1983):** 'The Symbolism of the Biblical Corner Stone in the Mediaeval West', in G. Ladner, ed., *Images and Ideas in the Middle Ages, Selected Studies in Hisotry of Art*, Rome, 171-196.
- Lafontaine-Dosogne J. (1964):** *Iconographie de l'enfance de la Vierge dans l'empire byzantin et en occident*, I-II, Brussels.
- Lafontaine-Dosogne J. (1968):** 'Théophanies – Visions auxquelles participent les prophètes dans l'art byzantin après la restauration des images', *Synthronon, Art et Archéologie de la fin de l'Atniquité et du Moyen Age, Recueil d'études* (Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologiques), Paris, 135-48.
- Lamb J. A. (1962):** *The Psalms in Christian Worship*, Glasgow.
- Lampe G. W. H. (1961):** *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford.
- Lampe G. W. H. – Woollcombe K. J. (1957):** *Essays on Typology*, London.
- Lassus J. (1973):** *L'illustration byzantine du Livre de Rois* (Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologiques IX), Paris.
- Levi D. (1947):** *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*, I-II, Princeton – London – The Hague.
- Liddell H. G. – Scott R. (1948):** *A Greek-English Lexicon* (A New Edition Revised and Augmented throughout by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie), Oxford.
- Lidov A. (2002):** 'Heavenly Jerusalem: The Byzantine Approach', in B. Kühnel, ed., *The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Art. Studies in Honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Jerusalem.
- Lidov A. (2000):** 'Miracle-Working Icons of the Mother of God', in M. Vassilaki, ed., *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art* (exhibition catalogue), Milan, 47-57.
- Loerke W. (1984):** '“Real Presence” in Early Christian Art', in T. G. Verdon and J. Dally, eds, *Monasticism and the Arts*, New York, 29-51.
- Lowden J. (1988):** 'Observations on Illustrated Byzantine Psalters', *ArtB* 70, 242-60.
- Lowden J. (1992):** *The Octateuchs. A study in Byzantine Manuscript Illustration*, University Park.
- Lowden J. (2000):** 'An inquiry into the role of Theodore in the making of the Theodore Psalter', in C. Barber, ed., *Theodore Psalter, Electronic facsimile*, University of Illinois Press in association with the British Library, essay 2.
- MacCormack S. (1990):** 'Loca Sancta: The Organisation of Sacred Topography in Late Antiquity', in R. Ousterhout, ed., *The Blessing of Pilgrimage*, Urbana and Chicago, 7-40.

McGrath R. L. (1965): 'The Martyrdom of the Maccabees on the Brescia Casket', *ArtB* 47, 257-61.

Maguire H. (1981): *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium*, Princeton.

Maguire H. (1988): 'The Art of Comparing in Byzantium', *ArtB* 70, 88-103.

Maguire H. (1989): 'Style and Ideology in Byzantine Imperial Art', *Gesta* 28, 217-31.

Maguire H. (1994): 'Imperial gardens and the rhetoric of renewal', in P. Magdalino, ed., *New Constantines. The Rhythm of imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th centuries, Papers from the Twenty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St Andrews, March 1992*, Cambridge.

Maguire H. (1997): 'Images of the Court', in H. C. Evans and D. Wixom, eds, *The Glory of Byzantium, Art and Culture in the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261* (exhibition catalogue), New York, 183-91.

Malickij N. (1932): 'Le psautier byzantin à illustrations marginale du type Chludov, est-il de provenance monastique?', *L'Art Byzantine chez les Slavs* (Recueil Th. Uspenskij, II, 2), Paris, 235-43.

Mandas A. G. (2001): Α. Γ. Μαντάς, *Τό εἰκονογραφικό πρόγραμμα τοῦ ἱεροῦ βήματος τῶν βυζαντινῶν ναῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδας (843-1204)*, Athens.

Mango C. (1958): see Photios, *Homilies*, (Primary Sources, above).

Mango C. (1977): 'The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin, eds, *Iconoclasm, Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, Birmingham, 133-140.

Mango C. (1980): *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*, London.

Mango C. (1986): *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453, Sources and Documents*, Toronto.

Mariès L. (1950): 'L'irruption des saints dans l'illustration des psautiers byantins', *AB* 68, 153-62.

Martin E. J. (1978): *A History of the iconoclastic controversy*, London (2nd edition).

Mathews T. F. (1971): *The Early Churches of Constantinople, Architecture and Liturgy*, University Park – London.

Mathews T. F. (1977): 'The Epigrams of Leo Sacellarios and an Exegetical Approach to the Miniatures of Vat. Reg. Gr. 1', *OCP* 43, 94-133.

- Meyendorff P. (1984):** See Patriarch Germanos, *Ecclesiastical History* (Primary Sources, above).
- Merony M. W. (1998):** 'The Reconciliation of Paganism and Christianity in the Early Byzantine Mosaic Pavements of Arabia and Palestine', *Liber Annuus* 48, 441-482.
- Miner D. E. (1955):** 'The "monastic" psalter of the Walters Art Gallery', in K. Weitzmann, ed., *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in honor of Albert Mathias Friend Jr.*, Princeton, 232-53.
- Moran N. K. (1986):** *Singers in Late Byzantine and Slavonic paintings*, Leiden.
- Morey C. R. (1959):** *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library, with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections*, Vatican City.
- Mother of God (2000):** M Vassilaki, ed., *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art* (exhibition catalogue), Milan.
- Mouriki D. (1990):** Ντ. Μουρίκη, 'Εικόνες από τον 12^ο ως τον 15^ο αιώνα', in K. Α. Μαναφής, ed., *Σινά. Οι Θεσσαυροί της Ι. Μονής Αγίας Αικατερίνης*, Athens.
- Mühlenberg E. (1975-78):** *Psalmekommentare aus der katenenüberlieferung*, I-III, Berlin – New York.
- Munitiz A. (1974):** 'Synoptic Greek accounts of the Seventh Council', *REB* 32, 147-86.
- Murray C. (1977):** 'The Christian Orpheus', *CA* 26, 19-27.
- O'Connell P. (1972):** *The Ecclesiology of St Nicephorus I (758-828), Patriarch of Constantinople. Pentarchy and Primacy*, Rome.
- Oikonomides N. (1994):** 'La couronne dite de Constantin Monomaque', *TM* 12, 241-62.
- Olster D. (1994):** 'Byzantine hermeneutics after Iconoclasm: word and image in the Leo Bible', *Byzantion* 64, 419-458.
- Omont H. (1886):** *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs des Bibliothèque de Suisse*, Leipzig.
- Omont H. (1927):** *Miniatures des Homélies sur la Vierge du moine Jacques (ms. Gr. 1208 de Paris)*, Paris.
- Omont H. (1929):** *Miniatures des plus anciens manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale du Vie au Xle siècle*, Paris.
- Openshaw K. M. (1989):** 'The battle between Christ and Satan in the Tiberius Psalter', *JWarb* 52, 14-33.

Openshaw K. M. (1993): 'Weapons in the Daily Battle: Images of the Conquest of Evil in the Early Medieval Psalter', *ArtB* 75, 17-38.

Ousterhout R. (1990): 'Loca Sancta and the Architectural Response to Pilgrimage', in R. Ousterhout, ed., *The Blessing of Pilgrimage*, Urbana and Chicago, 108-124.

Papastavrou H. (1989): 'Le symbolisme de la colonne dans la scène de l'Annonciation', *ΔΧΑΕ* (IV) 15, 145-60.

Papastavrou H. (1993): 'Le voile, symbole de l'Incarnation. Contribution à une étude sémantique', *CA* 41, 141-168.

Parry K. (1989): 'Theodore the Studite and the Patriarch Nicephoros on Image-Making as a Christian Imperative', *Byzantion* 59, 164-83.

Parry K. (1996): *Depicting the Word. Byzantine Iconophile Thought of the Eighth and Ninth Centuries* (The Medieval Mediterranean 12), Leiden – New York – Köln.

Parson S. C. (1982): See Patriarch Germanos, *Ecclesiastical History* (Primary Sources, above).

Patterson- Ševčenko N. (1998): 'Illuminating the Liturgy: Illustrated Service Books in Byzantium', in L. Safran, ed., *Heaven on Earth, Art and the Church in Byzantium*, University Park, 152-185.

Peers G. (2001): *Subtle Bodies. Representing Angels in Byzantium*, Berkeley – Los Angeles.

Pelekanidis S. M. et alii (1975): Σ. Μ. Πελεκανίδου, Π. Κ. Χρήστου, Χ. Μαυροπούλου-Τσιούμη, Σ. Ν. Καδᾶ, *Οἱ Θησαυροὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους, εἰκονογραφημένα χειρόγραφα*, vol. II, Athens.

Pelekanidis S. M. et alii (1979): Σ. Μ. Πελεκανίδου, Π. Κ. Χρήστου, Χ. Μαυροπούλου-Τσιούμη, Σ. Ν. Καδᾶ, Α. Κατσαροῦ, *Οἱ Θησαυροὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους, εἰκονογραφημένα χειρόγραφα*, vol. III, Athens.

Perl E. (1998): ' "...That man might become God": Central Themes in Byzantine Theology', in L. Safran, ed., *Heaven on Earth, Art and the Church in Byzantium*, University Park, 39-57.

Provatakis Th. M. (1980): Θ. Μ. Προβατάκη, *Ὁ Διάβολος εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Τέχνην*, Thessaloniki.

Rahlfs A. (1914): *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens Bd. 2), Berlin.

Revel-Neher E. (1995): 'On the Hypothetical Models of the Byzantine Iconography of the Ark of the Covenant', in Ch. Moss and K. Kiefer, eds., *Byzantine East, Latin West, Art-Historical Studies in honor of Kurt Weitzmann*, Princeton, 405-411.

Rom und Byzanz (1998): R. Baumstark, ed., *Rom und Byzanz, Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen* (exhibition catalogue), Munich.

Rondeau M.-J. (1982): *Les commentaries patristiques du Psautier (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, I, Rome.

Sahas D. J. (1986): *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm. An annotated translation of the Sixth Session of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Nicea, 787), containing the Definition of the Council of Constantinople (754) and its refutation, and the Definition of the Seventh Ecumenical Council*, Toronto.

Ščepkina M. V. (1977): *Miniatjura Khludovskoi Psaltiri*, Moscow.

Ševčenko I. (1965): 'The anti-iconoclastic poem in the Pantocrator Psalter', *CA* 15, 52-60.

Siegel B. A. (1977): *Der Vorhang der Sixtinischen Madonna*, Zurich.

Stern H. (1974): 'Orphée dans l'art paléochrétien', *CA* 23, 1-16.

Stichel R. (1981): 'Zur Herkunft des griechischen Chludov Psalters', *XV Congrès international des études Byzantines, Athens 1976, II. Art et archéologie, Communications*, vol. B, Athens, 733-38.

Stornajolo C. (1910): *Miniature delle Omilie di Giacomo Monaco (Cod. Vat. gr. 1162) e dell'Evangelario Greco Urbinate (Cod. Vat. Urbin. gr. 2) con breve prefazione e sommaria descrizione* (Codices e Vaticanis selecti phototypice, Series minor, I), Rome.

Strunk O. (1955-56): 'The Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia', *DOP* 9-10, 177-202.

Taft R. F. (1978): *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, II, The Great Entrance, A History of the Transfer of Gifts and other Pre-anaphoral Rites*, Rome (2nd edition).

Taft R. F. (1980-81): 'The Liturgy of the Great Church: an Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm', *DOP* 34-35, 45-75.

Taft R. F. (1997): *Beyond East and West, Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, Rome (2nd edition).

The Glory of Byzantium (1997): H.C. Evans and D. Wixom, eds, *The Glory of Byzantium, Art and Culture in the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261* (exhibition catalogue), New York.

Theodore Psalter (2000): C. Barber, ed., *Theodore Psalter, Electronic facsimile*, University of Illinois Press in association with the British Library.

Thérel M.-L. (1973): *Les symbols de l'“ecclesia” dans la creation iconographique de l'art Chrétien du IIIe au VIe siècle*, Rome.

Thomson R. W. (1975): 'The Maccabees in early Armenian historiography', *Journal of Theological Studies* 26, 329-41.

Tikkanen J. J. (1903): *Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter* (Helsingors, 1985, 1987, 1900), *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, 31, no. 5, Helsinki.

Tomadakis N. (1986): 'Εἰκονογραφικά. Εἰκονόφιλοι-Εἰκονομάχοι-Ὁρολογία. Ἡ ἀνατολική ὀρθόδοξος ἐκκλησία περί τῶν ἱερῶν εἰκόνων καί τῆς προσκυνήσεως αὐτῶν', in *Τιμητικός Τόμος Ἀνδρέα Στράτου*, vol. 2. Athens, 673-709.

Travis J. (1984): *In Defense of the Faith, the Theology of Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, Brookline (Mass.).

Trilling J. (1978): 'Myth and metaphor at the Byzantine court. A literary approach to the David plates', *Byzantion* 48, 249-263.

Trilling J. (1989): 'The Soul of the Empire: Style and Meaning in the Mosaic Pavement of the Byzantine Imperial Palace in Constantinople', *DOP* 43, 27-72.

Tsironis N. (2002): 'The Mother of God in the Iconoclastic Controversy', in M. Vassilaki, ed., *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art* (exhibition catalogue), Milan, 27-39.

Tsorbatzoglou P.-G. (1995): Π.-Γ Τσορμπατζόγλου, 'Η φύση καί προοπτική τῆς εἰκονομαχίας. Ἰδεολογικές ἐπιδράσεις, στόχοι καί σκοπιμότητα', *Θεολογία* 66 (Athens), 735-38.

Tsorbatzoglou P.-G. (2002): Π.-Γ Τσορμπατζόγλου, *Εἰκονομαχία καί κοινωνία στά χρόνια τοῦ Λέοντος Γ' Ἰσαύρου. Συμβολή στήν διερεύνηση τῶν αἰτίων*, Thessaloniki.

Tsuji S. G. (1983): 'Destruction des portes de l'Enfer et ouverture des portes du Paradis, à propos des illustrations du Psaume 23,7-10 et du Psaume 117,19-20', *CA* 31, 5-33.

Tuerk J. (1999): 'An early Byzantine inscribed amulet and its narratives', *BMGS* 23, 24-42.

Underwood P. A. (1950): 'The Fountain of Life in Manuscripts of the Gospels', *DOP* 5, 42-138.

- Van den Ven P. (1955-57):** 'La patristique et l'hagiographie du Concile de Nicée de 787', *Byzantion* 25-27, 325-62.
- Velmans T. (1971):** *Le Tétraévangile de la Laurentienne*, Florence, Laur. VI. 23, (Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologiques VI), Paris.
- Vikan G. (1982):** *Byzantine Pilgrimage Art*, Washington D.C.
- Vikan G. (1990):** 'Pilgrims in Magi's Clothing: The Impact of Mimesis on Early Byzantine Pilgrimage Art', in R. Ousterhout, ed., *The Blessing of Pilgrimage*, Urbana and Chicago, 97-107.
- Vokotopoulos P. (1995):** Π. Βοκοτόπουλος, *Ελληνική Τέχνη. Βυζαντινές Εικόνες*, Athens.
- Volbach W. F. (1952):** *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz.
- Vzdornov G. (1978):** *Issledovanie o Kievskoi Psaltiri*, Moscow.
- Walter C. (1970):** *L'iconographie des conciles dans la tradition byzantine* (Archives de l'orient chretien 13), Paris.
- Walter C. (1976):** 'The significance of Unction in Byzantine Iconography', *BMGS* 2, 53-73; reprinted in *Studies in Byzantine Iconography*, Variorum Reprints, London, 1977, XIII.
- Walter C. (1980):** 'An Iconographical Note', *REB* 38, 255-260.
- Walter C. (1986):** 'Christological Themes in the Byzantine Marginal Psalters from the Ninth to the Eleventh Century', *REB* 44, 269-287.
- Walter C. (1987):** '“Latter-Day” Saints and the Image of Christ in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Marginal Psalters', *REB* 45, 205-222.
- Walter C. (1997):** 'IC XC NI KA: The apotropaic function of the victorious cross', *REB* 55, 193-220.
- Wander S. H. (1973):** 'The Cyprus Plates: The Story of David and Goliath', *MMJ* 8, 89-104.
- Wander S. H. (1975):** 'The Cyprus Plates and the *Chronicle* of Fredegar', *DOP* 29, 345-46.
- Webb R. (1997):** 'Salome's Sisters: The Rhetoric and Realities of Dance in Late Antiquity and Byzantium', in L. James, ed., *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium*, London – New York.
- Weitzmann K. (1935):** *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin.

- Weitzmann K. (1966):** 'Eine vorikonoklastische Ikone des Sinai mit der Darstellung des Chairete', *Tortulae: Studien zu altchristlichen und byzantinischen Monumenten* (Römische Quartalschrift 30, Supplement), 317-325.
- Weitzmann K. (1976):** *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons. Volume one: From the sixth to the tenth century*, Princeton.
- Weitzmann K. (1979):** *The miniatures of the Sacra Parallela, Parisinus Graecus 923* (Studies in Manuscript Illumination 8), Princeton.
- Weitzmann K. (1980):** 'The Sinai Psalter cod. 48 with marginal illustrations and three leaves in Leningrad', *Byzantine Liturgical Psalters and Gospels*, Variorum Reprints, London, VII, 1-12.
- Weitzmann K. (1982):** 'The Mosaic in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai', in *Studies in the Arts of Sinai*, Princeton, 5-19.
- Weitzmann K. (1996):** *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts, Addenda und Appendix*, Vienna.
- Weitzmann K. – Bernabò M. (1999):** *The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint, II, Octateuchs. The Byzantine Octateuchs*, Princeton.
- Weitzmann K. – Kessler H. L. (1990):** *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 38), Washington, D.C.
- Whittow M. (1996):** *The Making of the Orthodox Byzantium 600-1025*, (New Studies in Medieval History), Basingstoke and London.
- Wilkinson J. (1972):** 'The Tomb of Christ, An Outline of its Structural History', *Levant* 4, 83-97.
- Wilkinson J. (1977):** *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster.
- Wolska-Conus W. (1980):** 'Un programme iconographique du patriarche Tarasios?', *REB* 38, 247-54.
- Wortley J. (1982):** 'Iconoclasm and leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the relics', *ByzF* 8, 153-279.
- Wybrew H. (1996):** *The Orthodox Liturgy, the development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine rite*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, New York.
- Xyngopoulos A. (1929):** "Υπαπαντή", *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 6, 330-39.

Photographic credits

- Fig. 1. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 2. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 3. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 4. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 5. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 6. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 7. Weitzmann – Kessler (1990), fig. 3.
 Fig. 8. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 343.
 Fig. 9. Clair (1984), fig. 6.
 Fig. 10. Weitzmann – Bernabò (1999), fig. 944.
 Fig. 11. Kessler (1993), fig. 2.
 Fig. 12. Kessler (1993), fig. 3.
 Fig. 13. Weitzmann – Kessler (1990), fig. 895.
 Fig. 14. Weitzmann – Kessler (1990), fig. 753.
 Fig. 15. Paliouras (1985), fig. 165.
 Fig. 16. *Byzantium* (2002), cat. no. 1.
 Fig. 17. Mouriki (1990), fig. 19.
 Fig. 18. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 181.
 Fig. 19. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 229.
 Fig. 20. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 21. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 22. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 23. Ščepkina (1977).
 Fig. 24. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
 Fig. 25. Vzdornov (1978).
 Fig. 26. Džurova (1990), II.
 Fig. 27. Dufrenne *et alii* (1978).
 Fig. 28. Džurova (1990), I, p. 164.

- Fig. 29. Džurova (1990), I, p. 172.
- Fig. 30. Christou *et alii* (1991), fig. 205.
- Fig. 31. Christou *et alii* (1991), fig. 206.
- Fig. 32. *The Glory of Byzantium* (1997), p. 188.
- Fig. 33. Buchthal (1938), fig. 2.
- Fig. 34. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 429.
- Fig. 35. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 428.
- Fig. 36. Stevenson (1978), fig. 74.
- Fig. 37. Thérél (1973), fig. 14.
- Fig. 38. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 39. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 40. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 41. Galavaris (1995), fig. 21.
- Fig. 42. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 43. Chatzidaki (1996), fig. 11.
- Fig. 44. Brubaker (1999), fig. 30.
- Fig. 45. Brubaker (1999), fig. 36.
- Fig. 46. De Wald (1970), fig. 28.
- Fig. 47. Galavaris (1969), fig. 262.
- Fig. 48. Galavaris (1969), fig. 109.
- Fig. 49. Galavaris (1969), fig. 287.
- Fig. 50. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 431.
- Fig. 51. Weitzmann – Kessler (1990), fig. 118.
- Fig. 52. Buchthal (1938), fig. 4.
- Fig. 53. Džurova (1990), I, p. 182.
- Fig. 54. Christou *et alii* (1991), fig. 209.
- Fig. 55. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1973), fig. 103.
- Fig. 56. De Wald (1942), pl. IV.
- Fig. 57. Cutler (1984), fig. 160.
- Fig. 58. Cutler (1984), fig. 182.
- Fig. 59. Cutler (1984), fig. 347.
- Fig. 60. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 61. Džurova (1990), I, p. 180.
- Fig. 62. Vzdornov (1978).

- Fig. 63. Džurova (1990), II.
- Fig. 64. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 65. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 66. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 67. *The Glory of Byzantium* (1997), cat. no. 97.
- Fig. 68. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 207.
- Fig. 69. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 208.
- Fig. 70. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 71. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 211.
- Fig. 72. Photographic Service, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- Fig. 73. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 74. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 233.
- Fig. 75. Brubaker (1999), fig. 28.
- Fig. 76. Cutler (1984), fig. 212.
- Fig. 77. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 78. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 78.
- Fig. 79. Džurova (1990), I, p. 171.
- Fig. 80. Džurova (1990), I, p. 192.
- Fig. 81. Dufrenne *et alii* (1978).
- Fig. 82. Džurova (1990), II.
- Fig. 83. Cutler (1984), fig. 237.
- Fig. 84. Džurova (1990), I, p. 181.
- Fig. 85. *Byzantium* (2002), cat. no. 14.
- Fig. 86. Goldschmidt - Weitzmann (1930), I, pl. LXXI.
- Fig. 87. Džurova (1990), I, p. 182.
- Fig. 88. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 89. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 90. Photographic Service, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- Fig. 91. Photographic Service, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- Fig. 92. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 228.
- Fig. 93. *Byzantium* (2002), fig. 15.
- Fig. 94. Weitzmann – Bernabò (1999), fig. 1013.
- Fig. 95. Weitzmann (1979), fig. 78.
- Fig. 96. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).

- Fig. 97. *Byzantium* (2002), fig. 2.
- Fig. 98. Weitzmann (1976), pl. XXIX.
- Fig. 99. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 99. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 100. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 101. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 102. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 103. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 218.
- Fig. 104. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 105. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 106. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 107. Bertoli (1986), fig. 85.
- Fig. 108. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 109. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 110. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 111. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 112. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 203.
- Fig. 113. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 114. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 407.
- Fig. 115. Weitzmann (1979), fig. 447.
- Fig. 116. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1975), fig. 24.
- Fig. 117. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 118. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 222.
- Fig. 119. Grabar (1967), fig. 51.
- Fig. 120. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 398.
- Fig. 121. Weitzmann (1979), fig. 454.
- Fig. 122. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 123. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 124. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 125. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 126. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 216.
- Fig. 127. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 184.
- Fig. 128. Pelekandes *et alii* (1979), fig. 186.
- Fig. 129. *Rom und Byzanz* (1998), cat. no. 9.

- Fig. 130. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 453.
- Fig. 131. Cecchelli – Furlani – Salmi (1959).
- Fig. 132. Photographic Service, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- Fig. 133. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 134. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 224.
- Fig. 135. Grabar (1958), pl. XLVII.
- Fig. 136. Grabar (1958), pl. XVIII.
- Fig. 137. Barag – Wilkinson (1974), fig. 2.
- Fig. 138. Wilkinson (1972), pl. X.A.
- Fig. 139. Biddle (1999), fig. 16.
- Fig. 140. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 141. Biddle (1999), fig. 23.
- Fig. 142. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 143. Biddle (1999), fig. 24.
- Fig. 144. Grabar (1958), pl. XXIV.
- Fig. 145. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 146. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 147. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 148. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 231.
- Fig. 149. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 150. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 151. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 152. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 153. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 154. Galavaris (1969), fig. 467.
- Fig. 155. Ćurčić (1991), fig. 5.
- Fig. 156. Ćurčić (1991), fig. 8.
- Fig. 157. Kartsonis (1986), fig. 49.
- Fig. 158. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 520.
- Fig. 159. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 519.
- Fig. 160. Leroy (1964), pl. 119.2.
- Fig. 161. Underwood (1950), fig. 37.
- Fig. 162. Underwood (1950), fig. 35.
- Fig. 163. Underwood (1950), fig. 44.

- Fig. 164. Stornajolo (1910), p. 56.
- Fig. 165. Stornajolo (1910), p. 53.
- Fig. 166. Stornajolo (1910), p. 9.
- Fig. 167. Stornajolo (1910), p. 18.
- Fig. 168. Epstein (1986), fig. 5.
- Fig. 169. Der Nersessian (1993), figs 470-71.
- Fig. 170. Papastavrou (1989), fig. 4.
- Fig. 171. *Age of Spirituality* (1979), cat. no. 508.
- Fig. 172. Hutter (1993), 426.
- Fig. 173. Galey (1985), fig. 119.
- Fig. 174. Forsyth – Weitzmann (1973), pl. CLXXIV.
- Fig. 175. Elsner (1995), pl. 2.
- Fig. 176. Forsyth – Weitzmann (1973), pl. CXXIX.A.
- Fig. 177. Forsyth – Weitzmann (1973), pl. CXXIX.B.
- Fig. 178. Brubaker (1999), fig. 23.
- Fig. 179. Brubaker (1999), fig. 46.
- Fig. 180. Buchthal (1938), fig. 3.
- Fig. 181. Buchthal (1938), fig. 27.
- Fig. 182. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 183. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 219.
- Fig. 184. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 185. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 186. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 187. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 188. *Theodore Psalter* (2000).
- Fig. 189. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 190. Pelekanidis *et alii* (1979), fig. 223.
- Fig. 191. Ščepkina (1977).
- Fig. 192. Bertoli (1986), fig. 96.
- Figs 193-231. Ščepkina (1977).

Analysis of photographic-credit references

Books that do not appear in the following list can be found in the Bibliography

Christou P. K. et alii (1991): Π. Κ. Χρήστου, Χ. Μαυροπούλου-Τσιούμη, Σ. Ν. Καδᾶς, Α. Κατσαροῦ, *Οἱ Θησαυροὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους, εἰκονογραφημένα χειρόγραφα*, vol. IV, Athens.

Galavaris G. (1995): *Greek Art, Byzantine illuminated manuscripts*, Athens.

Galey J. (1985): *Sinai and the Monastery of St. Catherine*, Cairo.

Goldschmidt A. – Weitzmann K. (1930): *Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen des X.-XIII. Jahrhunderts*, I, Berlin; reprinted, Berlin 1979.

Grabar A. (1967): *L'arte paleocristiana (200-395)*, Milan.

Leroy J. (1964): *Les manuscrits syriaques a peintures conserves dans les bibliothèques d'Europe et d'orient*, Paris.

Paliouras A. (1985): *The Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai*, Glyka Nera.

Pelekanidis S. M. et alii (1973): Σ. Μ. Πελεκανίδου, Π. Κ. Χρήστου, Χ. Μαυροπούλου-Τσιούμη, Σ. Ν. Καδᾶ, *Οἱ Θησαυροὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους, εἰκονογραφημένα χειρόγραφα*, vol. I, Athens.

Stevenson J. (1978): *The catacombs. Rediscovered monuments of early Christianity*, London.

Illustrations